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Before Commissioner: Ms Margaret Cunneen SC

Counsel Assisting: Ms Julia Lonergan SC
Mr David Kell
Mr Warwick Hunt

Crown Solicitor's Office: Ms Emma Sullivan, Ms Jessica Wardle

MR WILLIS: Just for the record, my name is Willis. Mr Cohen is not available today. I'll be appearing for Mr Fox.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, two issues were raised on Friday afternoon which need to be dealt with. The first was an assertion by Mr Saidi, who acts for the NSW Police Service that there was a procedural fairness issue that had been substantially overlooked in relation to the calling or otherwise of a particular witness.

The second, Commissioner, concerned an issue regarding the integrity of the Special Commission of Inquiry processes relating to an application for a non-publication order that was made late on Friday afternoon. Turning back to the first matter, this Special Commission of Inquiry is an investigative process and the public hearings are part of that investigative process. As is evident to all in court and particularly those at the bar table, the investigative process and the public hearings are not finished. On occasion evidence will be given by a witness which leads to the necessity to call another witness. This has been dealt with on a number of occasions during the progress of the public hearing and on many occasions before the public hearing started as well.

As set out in the practice note if any party sees a witness as relevant, all they have to do is to approach the staff who assist you, Commissioner, and their request or suggestions will be entertained with courtesy and will be acted upon.

It is wrong and unfair to say, as Mr Saidi did at page 1888 of the transcript on Friday, that there was a procedural fairness issue in the circumstances. What had happened was that the calling of a particular witness crystallised the need to add another person to the list and the proper way to raise that would have been a discussion with counsel assisting and it could be dealt with in the normal course, as it has been on many other occasions.

THE COMMISSIONER: And on this occasion I believe.
MS LONERGAN: On this occasion I'm sure we can expect the assistance and cooperation that we have been provided with to date by those who act for the Police Service, who have on many occasions assisted us with the provision of
statements and records and assistance.
Moving to the second issue, the non-publication order, my learned friend Mr Baran made a submission which was with the best intention, in my respectful submission, Commissioner, but perhaps without the background knowledge that certain matters had already been extensively reported in the press. There was a suggestion made, I'm sure without any particular animus, that the integrity of the Commission's processes required that we manage certain issues in a certain way.

It is in the public interest that this Commission conducts its work in public to the extent that it can, and that matters are given a public airing and it will continue to do so and it is not correct to assert that the failure to publish certain matters will necessarily suggest that the Commission's integrity is being called into question. Thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: In relation to my non-publication order on Friday, it was done in the full knowledge that if anything was published it would have been the bare fact of the possession by that witness of the materials ventilated and I took the view that that was unfair, and particularly as the application was made in the first instance by his counse1. That is all I have to say on that matter at this stage.

MR KELL: Commissioner, I call Father Robert Searle.
<ROBERT GEORGE SEARLE, sworn: [10.18am]
<EXAMINATION BY MR KELL:
MR GYLES: Might it be noted the witness takes section 23 protection.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles. That is noted.
MR KELL: Q. Your full name is Robert Searle?
A. Robert George Searle.
Q. You are a parish priest at MacKillop parish?
A. I am.
Q. That's at Charlestown within the Maitland-Newcastle
diocese?
A. Yes .
Q. Can I show you a notice of appointments document.

I'11 hand one to the Commissioner. You were ordained on 24 August 1974?
A. I was.
Q. Father, have you been incardinated to the diocese since that time?
A. Ever since then, yes.
Q. You've been located at various parishes since being incardinated?
A. That's right.
Q. Commencing at Muswellbrook?
A. Commencing at Muswellbrook, that's right.
Q. Was that a position as an assistant priest?
A. Assistant priest.
Q. You then went to Raymond Terrace?
A. Yes.
Q. You are nodding yes. Then to Charlestown?
A. Yes.
Q. And then to other parishes?
A. Yes.
Q. From 1998 you were based at Ne1son Bay parish?
A. I was.
Q. And that was from January of that year?
A. Just before Christmas of 1997.
Q. How long were you at Nelson Bay?
A. Six years.
Q. When did you leave Nelson Bay?
A. February 2004.
Q. You were then at Charlestown-Gateshead?
A. Charlestown-Gateshead.
Q. What position did you have there?
A. Parish priest.
Q. From there to your present position at MacKillop?
A. That's correct.
Q. I just want to ask you whether in that period of time you held any particular offices other than obviously the important position of parish priest with the diocese, were you involved in any of the Diocesan consultors?
A. I was never a consultor.
Q. Were you ever a member of the Council of Priests of the diocese?
A. For one meeting.
Q. When was that?
A. In the late 1970s, early 1980s as a representative of the region. That was only one meeting, though.
Q. Taking into the account the fact that you only went to one meeting, for what period of time were you actually a member of the Council of Priests?
A. Three months maximum.
Q. How did it come to happen that you were a member on1y for that period of time?
A. The other priests in the region elected me to it.
Q. Why was it that you ceased to be a member of the Council of Priests after three months?
A. I think the council had finished its term and a new council was elected by the diocesan priests.
Q. You have been a priest of the parish since 1974 and assistant priest since 1974.
A. A priest of the diocese, yes.
Q. I just wants to ask you about whether in the 1970s and 1980s there were particular occasions when the priests of the parish would come together for work or social --
A. Priests of the diocese come together twice a year for clergy conferences.
Q. Twice a week - sorry, twice a year?
A. Twice a year for clergy conferences, yes.
Q. Were those conferences at which all of the priests of
the parish would regularly attend?
A. That's right.
Q. Were there other events where the priests of the parish would come together in the 1970s and 1980s?
A. It would have been social groupings, but I wasn't part of them. I didn't play golf.
Q. Were there also weekend retreats from time to time?
A. There would be a diocesan retreat each year for a period of one week.
Q. I just want to ask you about Father Denis McAlinden. You were aware he is one of the priests that this inquiry is concerned with?
A. I'm aware of that, yes.
Q. Had you ever met Father Denis McAlinden?
A. To the best of my knowledge I had never met him.
Q. I want to ask you when you first became aware of there being any concerns relating to McAlinden and children?
A. When this Commission started.
Q. This Commission started late last year. Are you identifying it as recent as that period?
A. I am identifying it then, yes.
Q. Did you become aware at any time earlier than that in terms of --
A. I was not aware of that.
Q. You are not aware of having seen references in the media at any earlier time?
A. Not - no, I haven't.
Q. The other priest that the Commission is concerned with is Father James Fletcher.
A. Yes.
Q. Had you met Father James Fletcher from time to time?
A. I met him at clergy conferences and clergy gatherings.
Q. Was he a friend of yours?
A. No, not a friend of mine.
Q. When did you first become aware of there being any
concerns in relation to Fletcher and children?
A. When charges were made publicly against him.
Q. You are identifying the period in 2003 when he was --
A. That's right.
Q. In 2004 rather when he was --
A. That's correct.
Q. In 2003 when he was charged by police?
A. When the charges were on, that's when we became aware of it.
Q. And not at any earlier point in time?
A. No.
Q. I want to ask you about some questions relating to [AH]. I think you have a pseudonym list in front of you. A. I do, yes.
Q. I think you're aware of the three individuals about which I might ask questions are [AH], [AH]'s mother [BI].

THE COMMISSIONER: [BJ].
MR KELL: Q. Sorry, [BJ] and [AH]'s father [BI]?
A. I'm aware of those three.
Q. If you could bear those pseudonyms in mind in respect of any answer you give, that would be appreciated. I just want to ask you about the period in about the late 1990s. At that time, it was the case, was it, that you knew [AH]'s family?
A. I may have - yes, I would have known [AH]'s family. I first met them when I was the parish priest at Glendale.
Q. That was obviously before you came to Nelson Bay?
A. To Nelson Bay.
Q. So you had known the family for some years by then?
A. I knew of the family. I met them once socially.
Q. And in the late 1990s you knew [BI]?
A. Very well.
Q. That was from the professional association of the diocese?
A. That's right.
Q. Had you also had some involvement in assisting [AH] in terms of his coming to reside in the parish at Ne 1 son Bay? A. We assisted getting the children of his partner into our parish school. It was at the request of his father who phoned me to see if that was possible.
Q. I'm going to ask you about an incident that occurred at some stage outside the presbytery at Nelson Bay.
A. Yes.
Q. I think that's an incident where [AH] attended and called out certain things. You are nodding yes?
A. Yes.
Q. I wonder if you could describe in general terms the incident, and I'll ask you some specific questions. If you could describe to the Commissioner generally what the incident involved?
A. Yes. I was in my lounge room, which fronts on to Government Road, one evening watching television and I heard this noise and yelling from outside.
Q. Pausing there, what time in the evening was that?
A. It would have been about $7.30,8$ o'clock.
Q. What time of the year, are you able to identify when it was?
A. I can't. I think it was winter.
Q. At that time was it dark outside?
A. It was dark.
Q. So you are inside the presbytery?
A. I am.
Q. You've got the television on?
A. I've got the television on.
Q. And you hear certain noises from outside?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to identify the approximate date on which this was? What year was it?
A. I thought it - well, I went to the bay at the end of 1997, so it could have been 1998, 1999.
Q. So you heard the sound from outside?
A. I did.
Q. At that stage, I take it it was night time?
A. It was night time.
Q. Doors were closed, were they?
A. The glass doors were closed, yes.
Q. So could you make out what was being said outside?
A. No, I just heard this yelling.
Q. You could heard yelling but you couldn't identify the particular words?
A. No, not at all.
Q. You had the television on as well?
A. I did.
Q. What did you do next?
A. I went out to the balcony.
Q. That involved you opening a --
A. Opening the doors and going out on to the balcony.
Q. What did you see?
A. I saw [AH] across the road near the telegraph pole.
Q. When you say he was across the road, he was on the other side of the road --
A. He would have been about 40,50 metres away from me.
Q. Was he directly opposite --
A. He was directly opposite.
Q. But on the other side of the road?
A. On the other side of the road.
Q. So there was the presbytery?
A. The presbytery.
Q. And you were on the balcony?
A. Yes.
Q. Do we take it from that that you were one level up from the ground?
A. I was above the ground, yes, the second floor.
Q. Between the presbytery and the road is there a nature strip and a footpath?
A. No, there is the driveway up to the garage to the presbytery, then there's an access road, then there's a drop brick wall or stone wall and then there's Government Road.
Q. What was the distance between your balcony and your side of the road?
A. Forty to 50 metres.
Q. I think you indicated [AH] was on the other side of the road?
A. He was.
Q. The distance between your balcony and the edge of the road on your side, the presbytery side?
A. About 32, 33 metres.
Q. Was it a single-lane road?
A. No, it's a double-lane road, Government Road.
Q. So there's a two-lane road, there is a lane of traffic going either side?
A. That's right.
Q. AH was on the other side?
A. He was.
Q. He was standing on the footpath on the other side?
A. He was.
Q. But in a direct line with the presbytery?
A. Yes, fairly direct.
Q. Could you see him clearly?
A. I could see who it was, yes. There's lighting around that area.
Q. Did you immediately identify who it was?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. In your own mind?
A. In my own mind I did.
Q. That's what you saw when you came to the balcony. What could you hear?
A. I could hear him yelling and that and I couldn't make out, it's a bit incoherent so I asked him what was wrong.
Q. He was yelling out and he was yelling towards you?
A. He was yelling towards me.
Q. Towards the presbytery building?
A. Towards the presbytery.
Q. You're saying at that stage you couldn't make out what was being said?
A. I couldn't make it out, it was incoherent.
Q. You indicated you asked what was wrong, did you?
A. I said, "What's wrong?"
Q. When you said it, did you have to yell it out because he was on the other side of the street?
A. I've got a fairly loud voice. He heard me and then he gave me some words.
Q. What did he say?
A. "Nobody loves me, nobody loves me." He was clearly upset.
Q. When you say he was upset, could you see whether he was in tears?
A. He had a beer bottle in his hand. He was, you know, clearly, in my opinion, intoxicated and he just kept on ranting and raving and they're the words I could distinctly hear.
Q. When you refer to him being intoxicated, in your view, did you form that view because of what he was calling out?
A. Because he was swaying.
Q. He said to you, "Nobody loves me, nobody loves me"?
A. Right.
Q. What else did he say?
A. That's all I could hear - that's all I could get out of him, "Nobody loves me", or that I could understand him saying, "Nobody loves me."
Q. So you are still on the balcony?
A. Yes.
Q. You've called out to him?
A. Yes.
Q. He said that to you?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you do next?
A. I told him - I said, "Of course people love you. You know your parents love you. You come from a good home. Your parents love you very much." Then again he responded, "Nobody loves me, nobody loves me." I said to him, "Look I'11 get your parents for you. I'11 go and ring your father."
Q. What was his response to that?
A. Again he was just - "Nobody loves me, nobody loves me", and then that was it. He was clearly making a disturbance.
Q. So he was still there making a disturbance and he was yelling out certain things?
A. That's right.
Q. Some you could hear; you could understand "Nobody loves me, nobody loves me"?
A. Yes.
Q. That was being yelled out?
A. It was being yelled out.
Q. He was making some other statements that you just couldn't --
A. I couldn't understand.
Q. You couldn't understand at the time?
A. No, I couldn't.
Q. What did you do next?
A. I went inside and rang his father.
Q. He was still outside?
A. He started to go off.
Q. This is before you went inside?
A. Before I went inside, yes.
Q. Did you ask [AH] whether to come inside with you?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Why not?
A. It just didn't occur to me to call him to come in never been - you know, I just was more concerned I suppose I was concerned that he would have been protected when he would have got home. That's the pastoral approach I would have taken. I came inside with the intentions of ringing his father straight away just to let him know what was happening.
Q. You indicated before you came inside that you saw him start to walk --
A. He started to walk off.
Q. Which direction did he walk?
A. I can't tell you that. I think down towards the police station but $I$ could be wrong in that.
Q. Did you stay on the balcony for a while to see him walk away?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. You just saw him take a few steps in a particular direction?
A. Yes.
Q. At that stage you came back inside?
A. I came back into the presbytery.
Q. At all stages when you saw [AH], did he have the bottle still --
A. Always had the beer bottle in his hand. I can remember that distinctly.
Q. Can I ask whether you've got any recollection in respect of [AH] throwing anything at the presbytery? Was that something that happened --
A. Didn't happen at all.
Q. It's not something that you saw?
A. I'm sorry, I didn't see that happen.
Q. Did you later form any view that he may have thrown something at the presbytery?
A. I didn't see anything - no broken glass or anything. I didn't see anything like that at all.
Q. For example, the next morning you didn't see any broken glass?
A. No, there wasn't any broken glass there.
Q. If there had been, is it something you would have had to clean up?
A. It would have been something I would have had to clean up, yes, but it would have been a distance for him to have thrown it at the presbytery.
Q. From where you saw him?
A. From where he was.
Q. During the time you were on the balcony?
A. Yes.
Q. Just in terms of that period of time, you hear him call out, you open the glass door, you go out to the balcony, then you have some discussion with him, and then at a certain point in time you see him walk off down the road or take some steps. How long was the period of time from when you first went out on the balcony to when [AH] moved away?
A. Ten minutes maximum.
Q. During that ten-minute period, you were talking to him. You are nodding yes?
A. Sorry, yes.
Q. Were you trying to comfort him?
A. Trying to get him calm I think. Yes.
Q. At certain times you said, "Your family loves you. You come from a great family"?
A. I did.
Q. He continued to yell out words?
A. He did.
Q. Your evidence is, is it, that in terms of what you can recall about him saying that the only thing you can recall at the moment is that he said, "Nobody loves me, nobody loves me"?
A. They're the words I can distinctly remember.
Q. But he certainly said other things during that period of time?
A. He was incoherent, I think. I couldn't understand what he was saying.
Q. So you came inside. What did you do then?
A. I went and got the phone book and looked up [BI]'s -

I had an idea where they were living, I looked up that phone number and I rang.
Q. Did you speak to [BI]?
A. I spoke to [BI].
Q. What did you say to [BI]?
A. I said that his son had been outside the presbytery and I was quite concerned because I thought that he was, you know, inebriated. I was concerned for his safety. And then he said - he responded - do you want me to tell you what he responded?
Q. What did [BI] say?
A. He said, "Bob, I've had a few glasses of red wine. If I can get somebody to come down, I'11 come down", and he did.
Q. I think you indicated it was about 7.30 , was it?
A. Yes, my phone call would have been about 8 o'clock or something like that.
Q. It's about 8 o'clock in the evening?
A. Yes.
Q. So [BI] said that he would make arrangements, did he, to come?
A. He said he'd make arrangements to get somebody to drive him down, which he did.
Q. How long after did [BI] arrive?
A. About three-quarters of an hour, an hour later.
Q. Did you speak to [BI] at the presbytery?
A. I did, he came to the presbytery.
Q. What did you tell him?
A. Exactly what happened, what $I$ just related.
Q. What did [BI] do at that point in time?
A. Well, he had a cup of coffee and then he went off to find his son.
Q. I just want to ask you in terms of the things that [AH] was calling out outside the presbytery, whether you've got any recollection, and it may be that you don't from what you've said today, of [AH] calling out things to do with making comments about priests; do you have any recollection about that?
A. I did not hear him use those words at all, no.
Q. Not that you can recall in terms of what you --
A. He didn't use those words.
Q. You're sounding very definite about that?
A. I can remember exactly - the only words I - that I can recall him saying were "Nobody loves me, nobody loves me."
Q. If it's suggested to you that part of what [AH] said outside the presbytery and which you heard at the time was that [AH] had been calling out about the filthy things that priests do to boys, what would you say to that suggestion?
A. I would say I never heard those words at all.
Q. And you're pretty confident that that's the case, that you'd recall if you had?
A. I'm fairly definite that $I$ would recall that.
Q. You accept the possibility, do you, that [AH] may have called out those things but you didn't hear them?
A. I can accept that possibility.
Q. For example, before you went to the balcony you heard sounds outside but you couldn't discern what was being said?
A. That's true.
Q. So you accept the possibility of course that it may have been said at that point in time before you came out to the balcony?
A. I accept the possibility but I also know I didn't hear them.
Q. And you accept the possibility that when you were on the balcony, among the words that you indicated to the Commissioner that you couldn't discern because of [AH]'s
intoxicated state, they might have --
A. If they were directed --
Q. If you just pause there and wait for the question.

That among the words that you may not have fully discerned, you accept the possibility that he may have said it at that point in time but you just didn't hear?

MR GYLES: I object. The problem with the question is "fully discerned".

THE COMMISSIONER: He didn't discern it at all.
MR GYLES: Exactly. Is it being said that he didn't hear it or did hear it? "Fully discerned" seems to suggests there is some part he may have heard.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. You know how to deal with that, Mr Kell.

MR KELL: Q. Father, do you accept the possibility that in the time that you were on the balcony, there were certain statements made by [AH] that you just didn't hear clearly what he said?
A. I didn't - I couldn't make out what he was saying.
Q. You accept the possibility that among that part of the shouting from [AH] may have been words to that effect, that you just couldn't make out, that is to say a reference to filthy things that priests do to boys?
A. I think I would have heard that clearly if that had been said.
Q. The events I'm asking you about occurred some 15 years ago; is that right?
A. That's about the area, space, yes.
Q. This is late 1997.
A. No, it would have been late 1998, 1999.
Q. At the time that these events occurred, you didn't take any notes?
A. No, not at all.
Q. You didn't make any written report following that event for any purpose?
A. No.
Q. And you're not able to draw on any contemporaneous note from that time now to assist your recollection of events?
A. No.
Q. And you're just doing the best that you can, sitting here some 15 years later giving evidence about that event.
A. I am.
Q. I want to ask you about whether you're able to assist with any attendance shortly before the day at the presbytery. What I'm asking about is whether you are able to link in your mind any involvement that you may have had with [AH] in a social gathering prior to the presbytery incident?
A. [AH] came to the back of the presbytery prior to that to thank me for the children getting into the school.
Q. How long before the presbytery incident --
A. I can't give you an honest answer, but I would imagine a couple of weeks beforehand.
Q. I also want to ask you about whether you've got any recollection of attending a dinner or lunch at the Nelson Bay RSL where you may have met [AH]?
A. I didn't meet [AH] at the RSL at Ne1son Bay. I didn't attend that club.
Q. Did you ever attend it for --
A. I went for church-related events, yes.
Q. Did you attend for meals or dinner at any time?
A. No, not as parish priest of Nelson Bay.
Q. Did you attend it at all at any time?
A. I would have; if we had a church-type function or dinners, I would have gone there. The RSL day and things like that.
Q. I'm not suggesting there's anything improper at all about it. That was when you were at Nelson Bay?
A. That was when I was at Ne 1 son Bay.
Q. If it was suggested to you that shortly before the presbytery incident, you were having lunch at the RSL club when you met [AH] and had a brief discussion with him at
that time, what would you say to that suggestion?
A. I'd say that didn't happen.
Q. If it was suggested that you may have made a comment that led to some connection with [AH] later attending at the presbytery, do we take it that you also --
A. I'm aware of the alleged comment. I didn't make that comment.
Q. Have you ever sort of encountered [AH] at the RSL club on any of the functions that you have been there with the church or otherwise?
A. No.
Q. You gave evidence that you spoke to [BI] on the night of the presbytery incident?
A. That's true.
Q. And that he came --
A. He did.
Q. -- and you had a discussion with him about [AH].
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have any conversations with any other person that evening relating to the presbytery incident?
A. Not at all.
Q. And particularly I want to ask whether you had any conversation with [BJ] that evening relating to the presbytery incident?
A. I've had no conversation with [BJ].
Q. When you say you've had no conversation with [BJ] --
A. Other than --
Q. Just wait for the question. Are you saying ever, that you've never had a conversation with [BJ]?
A. I would have had a conversation with [BJ] when I was parish priest at Glendale when I was at a social gathering in Cardiff one evening when two families and myself and other priests were present.
Q. Glendale was before your attendance at Nelson Bay?
A. Glendale was the parish I was in before Nelson Bay.
Q. Before your attachment to Nelson Bay?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have other conversations after that with [BJ]?
A. I had no conversation with [BJ].
Q. If it's suggested to you on the evening of the presbytery incident that you did have a conversation with [BJ], by phone, and that you'd indicated that " [AH] is over here and he's drunk and upset", what would you say to that suggestion?
A. That conversation didn't take place.
Q. Again, I'm asking you about an incident that's 15 years ago.
A. That's correct.
Q. You accept, of course, that it would be natural for a mother to be concerned about a son in circumstances that you describe about the presbytery?
A. I can accept that it is natural.
Q. And you'd telephoned [BI] --
A. I telephoned [BI].
Q. --[AH]'s father, one of the parents?
A. That's right.
Q. And, again, if it's suggested to you that in a conversation with [BJ] you had indicated that [AH] was angry and he's saying really weird stuff about priests and sex?
A. But I didn't have a conversation with [BJ] and that wasn't said.
Q. I'm asking for your response to that, and your response is that you didn't have the conversation with [BJ]?
A. That's correct.
Q. You provided a statement to police relating to the presbytery incident?
A. I did.
Q. That was a number of years later?
A. A few years later, yes.
Q. That was in 2003?
A. That's correct.
Q. Before I go to the police statement, after the presbytery incident, did you make any report about the matter to your bishop? Was that something that you would report to --
A. I would have spoken to Bishop Michael Malone about it the next day, and that's it, mainly because his father - as the Commissioner is very much aware - was employed by the diocese. I would have told him what happened.
Q. When you say "I would have", do you recall now that you did?
A. I did the next morning.
Q. That was an oral discussion you had?
A. It was a phone conversation.
Q. What did you tell Bishop Michael?
A. What happened.
Q. That is to say, [AH] had been outside?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did Bishop Michael indicate to you what he would do with the report that you --
A. Not at all. He just thanked me for letting him know.
Q. In 2003 you provided a statement to the New South Wales police in relation to the incident?
A. Was it 2003 or 2004? Around that time, yes.
Q. That was in connection with the Fletcher matter generally, wasn't it?
A. That's right.
Q. You were asked about this particular incident relating to the presbytery back in 1998, as you indicate - late 1998?
A. That's correct.
Q. I just want to ask about the process in which you came to be asked to provide a statement. Do you recall who asked you to provide a statement?
A. I received a phone call from whom I believed at the time was Detective Fox asking me would I be prepared to give evidence in connection with the incident in 1998,
1999.
Q. Just pausing there you say you received a phone call from a person you believed to be Detective Fox?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did the person identify themselves as Detective Fox?
A. I can't give you an honest answer on that.
Q. That phone call was effectively out of the blue, was it, at the time?
A. It came out of the blue.
Q. In 1998 there was the presbytery incident. This is some five years later?
A. That's correct.
Q. You get a telephone call from a police officer?
A. Yes.
Q. Where were you based in 2003? Were you still --
A. I was still at Nelson Bay.
Q. You got a call at the presbytery number, did you?
A. The presbytery, yes.
Q. What did the police officer say as best you can recall?
A. He asked would I be prepared to give a statement in connection with the events that happened. I said yes.
Q. You believe it was Detective Fox, do you?
A. I think it was Detective Fox, yes.
Q. Why do you believe it was Detective Fox?
A. Because the name just was there and it's been in my mind.
Q. Did the police officer who phoned you indicate in any way where he had got information relating to the presbytery incident?
A. No, not at all.
Q. Did the police officer outline to you the matters that he wanted you to address in a statement?
A. No, he didn't. He asked me would I be prepared to be interviewed and he arranged a time and a place, which

I duly attended.
Q. You then attended to be interviewed?
A. I went to the Nelson Bay police station and I was interviewed.
Q. What was the period of time between the phone call
that you received from this police officer and the attendance at the police station at Nelson Bay?
A. I believe it was three days.
Q. When you attended at the police station at Ne ison Bay, did you meet with one or more police officers?
A. I met with the local police who introduced me to the detective who interviewed me.
Q. When you say you met with the local police, does that mean that you went to the front counter?
A. I went to the front counter, that's right, yes.
Q. You were then directed, were you, to a particular office --
A. To a room where I gave my statement.
Q. You were directed to a room where you gave your statement?
A. Yes.
Q. At that period of time, when you were in the room, did you speak to more than one police officer or was it one police officer?
A. It was the one police officer, the detective and I he spoke with me and then had the statement done and I signed it accordingly.
Q. Was there any period of time at the Nelson Bay police station where you spoke to more than one police officer at the same time about the matters to do with the presbytery?
A. No, only with the detective.
Q. Who was the detective you spoke to --
A. I thought it was Detective Fox, but I subsequently found out it was Detective Brown.
Q. Pausing there, when you say, "I thought it was Detective Fox", when did you think it was Detective Fox? A. When it was happening. Then I found out it wasn't.
Q. Was that because - that's your recollection now, is it?
A. That's my recollection now.
Q. Why did you think it was Detective Fox?
A. I just thought it was a natural progression that the person that phoned me would have interviewed me.
Q. The person that interviewed you, presumably identified himself at the time that you met him?
A. He would have yes.
Q. Do you recall now whether he identified himself?
A. He did.
Q. How did he identify himself?
A. That "I'm such and such" and shook my hand, and then we went and had the interview.
Q. Do you recall now whether he identified himself by a particular name and what that name was?
A. I can't give you an honest answer on that, because, you know - I know it was Detective Brown, but, you know, I probably at the time still thought it was - I would have realised there and then if he said he was Detective Brown, that would have been fine with me.
Q. When you say you realise now it was Detective Brown, what do you base that on?
A. The evidence that's coming out.
Q. When you refer to "the evidence that's coming out", what are you referring to?
A. To what I heard only in the last couple of weeks.

In my mind I thought it was Detective Fox, but, you know and I am quite at peace about the fact that it was Detective Brown.
Q. I'11 take you to your statement shortly. When you referred to the evidence coming out in the last couple of weeks, are you referring to the evidence before this inquiry?
A. I am.
Q. Have you in fact been following the evidence before the inquiry?
A. I have not been following the evidence. I heard it on the radio, on the media.
Q. So you heard a media report that referred to the attendance at the Nelson Bay police station?
A. By Detective Brown, that's true.
Q. Did that jog any memory in your mind?
A. No, it didn't.
Q. You indicated that you were taken to a room and provided your statement.
A. I did.
Q. Was that in the form of a questions being asked of you and --
A. He asked me my recollections and he asked me questions. He asked me did I see a bottle being thrown, which I didn't, and he just asked me generally what happened.
Q. So the detective asked you whether there was a bottle thrown at the presbytery?
A. He did ask me that.
Q. Did the detective also ask you about the things that you had heard being called out?
A. He asked me what I had heard and I told him what I had heard.
Q. Did he ask you about the statement that I asked for your view on, as to whether there had been any reference to the filthy things that priests do to boys?
A. No, he didn't ask me that at all.
Q. On your right there are some folders of material. There will be a volume identified as volume 5 .
A. Volume 5 of 7 ?
Q. Yes. If you jump to tab 385 , you'11 see I think that that is a police statement that you've provided.
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. It's a statement dated 19 May 2003 and that's your signature at the bottom of those --
A. That's my signature, sir.
Q. Is that the statement that you provided to police at the Nelson Bay police station in 2003?
A. That's correct.
Q. Was this statement given to you to sign during the one visit that you attended at Nelson Bay?
A. That's correct.
Q. There was a question and answer session and then a document prepared.
A. That's right.
Q. By the police officer?
A. By the police officer or the staff there.
Q. And then you reviewed it?
A. And then I signed it.
Q. And you signed it and that's the document?
A. That's the document.
Q. When you provided this statement to the police, you were intending to be truthful as to the events that you were recounting?
A. Yes .
Q. You were intending to be accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. And to not leave out any particular details that you regarded as significant?
A. That's correct.
Q. In paragraphs 4 to 6 you refer to [AH] being outside the presbytery and you make reference to [AH], in paragraph 4, having called out "Nobody loves me, nobody loves me"?
A. That's right.
Q. In paragraph 7, after a time, you say that [AH] "continued to yell out the same kind of things" and you indicated:

I said to [AH], "If you don't leave I will have to call the police and your parents."
A. That's right.
Q. When you're referring to "the same kind of things", what was that a reference to?
A. "Nobody loves me, nobody loves me." That's all he just went on - he was - he was clearly upset and I was concerned about the neighbours at this stage.
Q. So "the same kind of things" is your shorthand for a reference to "Nobody loves me, nobody loves me"?
A. No.
Q. Not a slight variant on that?
A. No.

MR KELL: Commissioner, I tender that statement.
THE COMMISSIONER: The statement of Father Searle of 19 May 2003 will be admitted and marked exhibit 162.

EXHIBIT \#162 STATEMENT OF FATHER SEARLE OF 19/05/2003
MR KELL: I tender the appointments list of Father Searle.
THE COMMISSIONER: The appointments list of Father Searle will be admitted and marked exhibit 163.

## EXHIBIT \#163 APPOINTMENTS LIST OF FATHER SEARLE

MR KELL: Q. You can close that up for the moment. In the period leading up to your signing this document, so three days before you signed the statement, you had a telephone call from a detective?
A. That's correct.
Q. Who you understand to be Detective Fox?
A. That's right.
Q. Three days later you went to Ne1son Bay police station, you were interviewed and then you finalised and signed a statement to the police?
A. Yes .
Q. In that period of time, did you have any discussions with any other church officials in relation to --
A. The incident.
Q. -- the contents of what you were addressing?
A. The on1y --
Q. Just wait for the question. Did you have any discussions with any other church officials relating to the matters about which you were going to provide evidence to the police?
A. No.
Q. You indicated a moment ago "the only thing that" --

THE COMMISSIONER: I think it was "the only person".
Q. Is that right, father?
A. Thank you, Commissioner.

MR KELL: Q. Is that right?
A. The person I would have spoken to about it other than Bishop Michael is Sister Paula Redgrove, who was my pastoral assistant.
Q. When you say, "The person that I would have spoken to about it", are you talking about events in 2003 when you were providing the statement or are you going back to late 1998?
A. No, 2003 I would have told her that I had been called to give evidence, because I would have spoken with her about the event the day after it happened in 1998.
Q. Is that because in both instances Sister Paula was --
A. Sister Paula was still my pastoral associate.
Q. She was based at Nelson Bay?
A. Yes.
Q. With the Sisters of Mercy?
A. Sisters of Mercy.

MR KELL: That's the evidence-in-chief.
<EXAMINATION BY MR WILLIS:
MR WILLIS: Q. I'm not sure whether you still have in front of you the statement that is now exhibit 162, which was a statement that you made back on 19 May 2003. I can probably do this without asking you to drag it out. Have you seen that statement before today?
A. I haven't seen it until today.
Q. Between the time that you made it back in 2003 until it being shown to you in the witness box just a short time ago --
A. I saw it prior to coming into the court today.
Q. Prior to coming into court today?
A. Today.
Q. Did you have the opportunity of reading through it?
A. I did.
Q. Father, you give your evidence today as if you have a very good recollection of what happened outside the presbytery in 1998; would you agree with that?
A. I do.
Q. Do you have a good recollection of that?
A. I do.
Q. And indeed the process that followed that, and you making a statement to the police in 2003, you have a good recollection of that as well?
A. I do.
Q. I just want to take you through this sequence of events at the presbytery. As I understand it from your evidence, you say that you were inside the presbytery, your attention was drawn to an incident outside by what you heard; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. When you got up to investigate that, you saw [AH] across the road?
A. I did.
Q. And he had been calling out things apparently prior to you going out on to the balcony; is that right?
A. He was making noises prior to my going out on the balcony.
Q. You were unable to hear what that was?
A. I wasn't able to hear.
Q. And all that you heard him say, on any occasion that he said something that you could hear, was words to the effect of "Nobody loves me"?
A. That's correct.
Q. You knew [AH] of course, didn't you?
A. I had met [AH], yes.
Q. Indeed, you told him, so you've told the Commission, that, of course, people loved him, he had a wonderful family and things of that nature; is that right?
A. I did.
Q. Did it seem to you to be odd that he would have been calling out that type of thing, "Nobody loves me" to the church presbytery?
A. I made no judgment on what he was saying. I just heard him and I told you what my response was. I did not think it was odd.
Q. I beg your pardon?
A. As he was inebriated, I did not think it was odd.
Q. As I understand it, you say that you spoke to [AH], told him that you would go inside and you would call the police and his parents; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. He started to wander off down the road?
A. He did.
Q. You went inside and you called --
A. His father.
Q. -- his father and you've told us about the conversation that you had with him. Did you tell [BI], that is, [AH]'s father, anything about what had happened at the presbytery?
A. I relayed to [BI] what had happened. That's why I called him.
Q. In particular what you had heard [AH] say?
A. I did.
Q. Is all that you relayed to [BI] about what [AH] had said simply that he was saying, "Nobody loves me, nobody loves me"?
A. That's true, and I would have told [BI] that I told him that he loved him.
Q. While you were having that conversation on the phone with [BI], was [AH] still out the front?
A. I don't think he was. I'm not aware of it.
Q. You couldn't still hear him --
A. I saw [BI] [sic] walk off before I went back inside the presbytery.
Q. You saw [AH] walk off?
A. I'm sorry, [AH] walk off, yes.
Q. He wasn't still out the front while you were on the phone with [BI]?
A. It's possible he could have been, but I didn't see him.
Q. And you couldn't hear him?
A. Couldn't hear him.
Q. You said that [BI] arrived about three-quarters --
A. About an hour later, three-quarters of an hour later.
Q. Obviously [AH] wasn't out the front of the presbytery then?
A. He wasn't out the front at all.
Q. Between the time that you saw him walk off in the direction apparently of the police station and the time that [BI] arrived, did you hear [AH] out the front at all? A. Not after he'd gone.
Q. Do you say that on that night you never spoke to [BJ], who was [AH]'s mother, on the telephone --
A. No, I didn't have any conversation with [BJ] at all.
Q. Did you relate to either [BI] or [BJ] at any stage that what [AH] had been saying out the front of the presbytery was words to the effect that he had been saying really weird stuff about priests and sex?
A. No, that was never said.
Q. But did you ever say that to --
A. I've never said that.
Q. You've never said that. That's not something that you heard [AH] say?
A. I didn't hear [AH] say that.
Q. But of course back in 1998, you had no idea what was behind [AH]'s behaviour.
A. None at all, sir.
Q. And then nothing further happened in terms of that incident until May 2003 when you were contacted by a police officer, who you believed to be Mr Fox?
A. That's true, nothing else happened.
Q. And that phone call you said just came out of the blue?
A. It came out of the blue.
Q. Did Mr Fox - assuming that it was Mr Fox - say to you in that conversation, or rather, did he ask you what you could say about the incident at the presbytery in $1998 ?$ A. My recollection is that he personally phoned me and asked me would I be prepared to be interviewed and give a statement about the events of that evening in 1998/1999 and I indicated I would, and that was it.
Q. But did he do that without asking you on the phone what you might say about it?
A. He didn't ask me on the phone what I might say.
Q. So he didn't identify either what you could say or whether you could say anything about it, but he simply asked you if you would be agreeable to coming down and give a - -
A. He asked me did an incident happen, to which I replied yes, and would I be prepared to give a statement about it.
Q. So he asked you did the incident happen?
A. He did ask me that, yes.
Q. Did he ask you, or did he suggest to you what incident it was that happened?
A. No.
Q. He must have said something?
A. He would have asked me and I told him that a person had been outside the - across the road, but there was no substance to the conversation about the content because that was given - because he asked me would I be interviewed and I agreed readily to it.
Q. But there was certainly enough said in the conversation for you to identify what it was that -A. Yes.
Q. -- the police wanted to talk to you about?
A. Definitely.
Q. Did you, in your conversation with that officer, and again if you assume it was Mr Fox, tell him that [AH] was talking about filthy things that priests do to children?
A. It's not my language and, no, I didn't say that at al1.
Q. And you've never suggested that to anyone?
A. I've never suggested that to anyone.
Q. That was not anything you ever heard [AH] say out the front of the presbytery?
A. I never heard $[\mathrm{AH}]$ say that at all.
Q. You were asked by Mr Kell about when you first learned that there was some issue in relation to then Father Fletcher and children, and I think you said that it was about the same time that you were contacted for the purposes of the statement, was it?
A. No. We heard about it through the media when he was charged.
Q. When he was charged?
A. That's right.
Q. Wasn't that about the same time as the --
A. I can't give an honest answer. I don't know that date, sir.
Q. You don't know that date. You were also asked about an occasion at the Nelson Bay RSL club about seeing [AH] there and about having a conversation with him. Do you recal1 that?
A. I don't recall that at all.
Q. You recall being asked that question?
A. I'm sorry, yes, I recall being asked that, yes.
Q. But you say that didn't happen?
A. To the best of my knowledge, that did not happen.
Q. You mentioned a comment. It's not necessary for us to go into what the comment was, but you mentioned a comment that apparently has been attributed to you having been made to [AH], but you say there was no such comment made by you; is that right?
A. It's not my language and it wasn't made by me.
Q. Father, do you recall having a concern at one time that the allegation that had been made or complaint that had been made by [AH] may have involved yourself - that you may have been the subject of a complaint?
A. No, not at all.
Q. Did you ever have a concern about --
A. No, I've never had a concern about that.
Q. Do you recall having a conversation on the telephone with Mr Fox to that effect where you expressed that concern to him?
A. No, I have no recollection of that at all.
Q. And he assured you that there was no such complaint about your behaviour and that you need not concern yourself?
A. I haven't heard that conversation, sir.
Q. So you say that just didn't take place, either?
A. It didn't take place, either, and that I would have remembered.
Q. I would expect so. Just going back to that statement, Father Searle, and the making of the statement, do you recall you were contacted on the telephone and an appointment was made, I think you said, for you to go in and make the statement, or be interviewed; is that right? A. That's right.
Q. Do you recall that there was some cancellation or postponement of that happening for a short period of time? A. No, I have no recollection of that.
Q. So far as your recollection is concerned, you went to the police station on the appointed day and you made your statement; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. I think we now understand, because you do, too, that
it was in fact a Detective Brown who took your statement from you.
A. I now understand that.
Q. But you knew on the day that you weren't dealing with Mr Fox, didn't you?
A. Only when - I thought it was Mr Fox, but then the gentleman would have identified himself as he shook hands with me, I'm sure.
Q. Do you recal1 speaking to Detective Fox at all about the detail of what might be expected in your statement -A. No.
Q. Let me finish, please - prior to you actually going through that process with Detective Brown?
A. No.
Q. Before Detective Brown sat you down in a room and started to ask you questions and record information that you were giving to him, no police officer had asked you what you might say about the incident at the presbytery in 1998; is that what you're saying?
A. No police officer asked me that.
Q. Pardon me for a moment. Can I just take you back to the presbytery in 1998. You went out to the balcony and you saw [AH] across the road and clearly he was upset. Did you not think that perhaps it might have been an exercise of appropriate pastoral care to bring him into the presbytery?
A. No. Clearly he was intoxicated. I learned with my conversation to him that he was upset.
Q. Did [AH] appear to you - he was upset, you've described and I've repeated that to you, but did he appear to be angry?
A. No.
Q. Angry at the world?
A. No.
Q. What was it about [AH]'s behaviour then, outside the presbytery, that you thought called for the intervention of the police?
A. In connection with the police, I just wanted him to move on. That's what I said - I said, "You know, I'11 call
your parents and call the police. You'll have to move on."
Q. But he was not - on what --
A. He was on the main road and it's a very, very busy road and I was quite concerned for his safety on that main road.
Q. But not concerned enough apparently to invite him into the presbytery?
A. No, I wasn't concerned enough to go and invite him in.
Q. From what you say, he was across the road and all he was yelling out was "Nobody loves me"?
A. A11 I can hear from him and detect what he was saying was "Nobody loves me."
Q. And from what you heard, there was no unseemly language?
A. I didn't hear him use any unseemly language at all.
Q. There was no bottle thrown?
A. A bottle was not thrown in my presence.
Q. But, again, why did you think that, from what you've told us, it called for the intervention of the police, for him to be moved along?
A. Mainly because I didn't want the neighbours being disturbed by the whole event.
Q. Father, if [AH] had been saying - I appreciate that you never heard anything at the time, but if you had heard [AH] yelling out across the road, apparently directed at the church presbytery, that priests do weird sexual things to children, that would be something that you would find to be, firstly, distasteful?
A. Yes.
Q. Offensive?
A. Yes.
Q. Potentially damaging to the church?
A. I would have reported that straight away if that had been said.
Q. To whom?
A. To the police, and to my authorities.
Q. Father, when you made your statement on 19 May 2003, did you deliberately hold back some information from the police because you thought it was either distasteful or potentially damaging to the church?
A. Not at all.

MR WILLIS: Nothing further, thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Gyles?

## <EXAMINATION BY MR GYLES:

MR GYLES: Q. You said you had a conversation with [BI] which predated the presbytery incident in which he asked you to arrange for the children of [AH]'s partner to be enrolled in the local school.
A. That's right.
Q. Do you recal1 during that conversation [BI] saying anything to you about how [AH] was travelling at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. What did he say to you about that?
A. He said that he had had a rough time, that he had a drinking problem, that he was overcoming it.
Q. My learned friend Mr Willis asked you some questions on a hypothetical assumption as to whether if you had heard [AH] saying things about priests and sexual matters concerning children, it would have caused you certain concerns. Can we take it that, had that been said, that is something you would be very confident you would remember?
A. I would remember very much so, sir.
Q. So far as your dealings with Detective Fox and Detective Brown were concerned, is it the position that you were happy to give a statement to the police in connection with the Fletcher prosecution when you were asked to do so? A. Certainly.
Q. That you cooperated fully with Detective Brown in the process of giving the statement?
A. That's true.
Q. That you were honest and open with him in relation to your description of events concerning the night at the presbytery with [AH]?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that you didn't hold any information back from him?
A. I didn't.
Q. Father, have you ever knowingly or intentionally hindered or failed to assist in or cooperate with any police investigation of matters involving the sexual abuse of children, including those relating to McAlinden or Fletcher, or colluded with others to do so?
A. No, not at all.

MR GYLES: I have no further questions.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles. Mr Lewis?
MR LEWIS: No questions.
MR KELL: No re-examination. Could the witness be excused.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you for your evidence, Father Searle. You are excused.

## <THE WITNESS WITHDREW

MR KELL: Would that be a convenient time to take morning tea.

THE COMMISSIONER: We will adjourn for 20 minutes.
SHORT ADJOURNMENT
MR KELL: Commissioner, I recall Father William Burston.
<WILLIAM JOHN BURSTON,sworn
MR KELL: Commissioner, when Father Burston's evidence was suspended on the last occasion, I think Mr Gyles was in the process of nearing completion of some questions he had and other persons had asked questions of Father Burston. I have three matters that I want to raise with Father Burston and I'11 do that conveniently now rather than wait.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. That makes sense, doesn't it, Mr Gyles?

MR GYLES: Yes, I am content with that. Can I reinstitute the section 23 protection?

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR KELL:

MR KELL: Q. Father, you gave evidence across three days the week before last?
A. Yes.
Q. It was from Wednesday to Friday?
A. Yes.
Q. And you took an oath to give truthful evidence during that time?
A. Yes.
Q. You were in court on Friday when your counsel raised a question or a suggestion that certain events that occurred outside of court may have impacted on your memory or your ability to give evidence to the inquiry.

MR GYLES: I'm not sure - so far as what I said was I asked him whether that caused him stress prior to giving evidence.

MR KELL: Yes.
MR GYLES: And something that had rattled him to some extent.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you, Mr Gyles. That is the extent of it, then Mr Kell, so far.

MR KELL: I've got in mind that it was suggested at page 1377 of the transcript that the stress caused by outside events may have affected, to his mind, his memory in giving his evidence. That issue having been flagged in some way, I wanted to explore that with Father Burston insofar as it impacts on the processes of the inquiry.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Kell.
MR KELL: Q. Father, the events that took place outside court were obviously unfortunate and they involved, did
they, two incidents on Wednesday where you were approached by certain members of the public outside this courtroom. A. Yes.
Q. And that caused you some stress?
A. Yes.
Q. On Friday of that week the Commissioner adjourned your evidence until today.
A. Yes.
Q. So it has been over a week since those events that took place outside court - well over a week?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you regard those events that occurred outside of court as being stressful?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you regard them as having impacted in any way on your ability to give truthful evidence to the inquiry during the time that you gave evidence from Wednesday to Friday?
A. I don't think so, no.
Q. Do we take it from that that you don't regard it as having impacted on your ability to remember things that occurred in the past?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. The second matter I wanted to ask you about, Father Searle, was to do with Sister Paula Redgrove, so moving completely away from the events that took place a week or so ago --
A. Right.
Q. You know Sister Paula Redgrove?
A. I do.
Q. She's a member of the Sisters of Mercy?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it the case you've been friends with Sister Paula for more than 40 years?
A. Yes.
Q. You've always regarded her highly?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you had dealings with her in a pastoral and collaborative sense when you were involved at Centacare?
A. Maybe pastoral and collaborative are putting it a bit strongly, but certainly I had dealings with her, yes.
Q. Have there been other occasions on which Sister Paula as a Sister of Mercy has raised matters of pastoral concern relating to a parishioner with you as the priest?
A. I can't recall immediate instances, but it's more than likely to have happened, yes.
Q. That's something that's more than likely to have happened on various occasions over the many years in which you knew Sister Paula?
A. Yes.
Q. You'11 see in front of you there's a list of pseudonyms.
A. Yes.
Q. I want to ask you, also - you know, do you, who [AL] is, if you could just look at the pseudonym [AL]?
A. Yes.
Q. [AL] is someone that you've known, have you, for many years?
A. I have not known her personally, no.
Q. But you've known [AL]'s family for --
A. I've known about them. I haven't known them directly.
Q. At some point in time, is it the case you became aware - and we'll go to the point in time later - that [AL] identified herself as being a victim of McAlinden? A. Yes.
Q. Was that information that you obtained from Sister Paula?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to identify for the Commissioner when it was that you obtained information from Sister Paula that [AL] was a victim of McAlinden?
A. I can't give the precise time. It would have been certainly before 1996, but I'm not sure when before that.
Q. And you identify 1996 as being the time at which you became vicar general?
A. Yes.
Q. So the conversation that you had with Sister Paula was before then?
A. Yes.
Q. If it was suggested to you that the conversation that you had with Sister Paula might have been at about 1993, would that be something that you wouldn't be able to reject?
A. I would not be able to reject it, no.
Q. Similarly, you would accept that it's possible that the conversation with Sister Paula was in 1993 to 1994 - in that period of time?
A. Yes, I can accept that.
Q. Are you able to tell the Commissioner any of the details of the conversation that you had with Sister Paula? A. I can't be very - terribly precise about it, but --
Q. Doing the best you can and without sort of holding you to the particular form of words in an "I said/He said" basis, what are you able to recall about the conversation?
A. That [AL] had stated that McAlinden had sexually abused her and that she had confided that information to Sister Paula and that, if I recall, there was a very strong refusal to take it to the police.
Q. When you say "as I recall", is that something you recall being conveyed to you by Sister Paula?
A. Yes.
Q. Or you learning from some other source?
A. No, Sister Paula's conversation - well, information I got from her at that time. As I said, I can't remember "I said/She said."
Q. The conversation that you had with Sister Paula, do you recall whether that was in person?
A. No, I'm sorry, I can't, no.
Q. Or whether, for example, it might have been on the phone?
A. I can't recall that detail now.
Q. Do you recall whether it was only the two of you involved in the conversation at that time?
A. As far as I know, but I can't recall precisely.
Q. When Sister Paula told you this information, what did you say to Sister Paula?
A. Again, details don't come back --
Q. Doing the best that you can now, looking back on those events.
A. To advise her to take it to the authorities in the church, because there was that strong reluctance to take it to the police.
Q. That's what you told her?
A. It's the sort of information I would have told her, yes. I can't recall precise detail of it.
Q. At the moment you don't recal1 in fact what you said to Sister Paula when you received that information?
A. No, I don't recall it now, no.
Q. Doing the best that you can now, you think it is likely you would have said certain things to her?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it your evidence that you believe you would have said to her that she should take it to certain authorities within the church?
A. Yes.
Q. What's your reference to "certain authorities"?
A. To the vicar general or the to the bishop.
Q. Who as at $1993 / 1993$ was the vicar general?
A. Monsignor Allan Hart.
Q. The bishop at that time was Bishop Leo Clarke
A. Yes.
Q. Did you see it as your role to convey that information to either of those two persons?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Do you recall whether you did take steps to notify
either Monsignor Hart or Bishop Clarke?
A. I can't recall. I don't think I did, but I can't recall.
Q. But, again, you can't exclude the possibility that you may have done so?
A. I can't exclude the possibility, no.
Q. Do you recall any further discussions that you had with Sister Paula about the topic of McAlinden and [AL]? A. I don't immediately, no. I don't, I'm sorry.
Q. Are you aware as to whether Sister Paula did take further steps, to your knowledge, following what you had told her?
A. I'm not aware - I'm not - I can't recall immediately and I don't think I'm aware of that, but I'm not sure.
Q. Can I ask whether you became aware in about 1993 that Sister Paula had gone with [AL] to meet any other church officials? Is that something that you became aware of at about that time?
A. I don't think so. I'm not sure, no.
Q. Is it something that you became aware of at a later point in time?
A. I'm not sure of that. Sorry, I can't recall that.
Q. I might just ask you about another topic. Have you got volume 4 of the materials handy? You were asked some questions on the week before last about communications that you had with Mr Davoren?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were aware in 1999 that Mr Davoren was the head of the Professional Standards Office?
A. Yes.
Q. Of the Catholic Church?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was the director?
A. I'm not sure. I'm unsure of the title.
Q. Sorry, I withdraw that. He was the manager of the Professional Standards Office?
A. Whatever the title. I'm not sure.
Q. In August 1999 you wrote to John Davoren --
A. Yes.
Q. -- at Professional Standards Office and I just ask you to turn to tab 308.
A. Yes.
Q. That's a letter in response that you received from Mr Davoren?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's a letter from Mr Davoren at the Professional Standards Office?
A. Yes.
Q. In Sydney, addressed to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you subsequently had discussions with Mr Davoren?
A. I don't recall discussions.
Q. The letter that you sent to Mr Davoren was dated 10 August 1999. I just want you to go to that, which is at tab 304. You'11 see that's your letter addressed to John Davoren.
A. Yes.
Q. That's the letter to which you received a response from the Professional Standards Office on 24 August 1999.
A. Yes.
Q. The letter at tab 304 you've addressed to John Davoren and you've included the Pitt Street address but you've put in there Professional Standards Resource Group; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. It was your intention, wasn't it, consistent with the response you received, to communicate with the Professional Standards Office?
A. Yes .
Q. And the letter that you received from Mr Davoren at tab 308 was consistent with that?
A. Yes.

MR KELL: Thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Anything arising?
MS GERACE: May I ask a few questions following on something raised by Mr Kell ?

THE COMMISSIONER: Does that suit you, Mr Gyles. Are you in the middle of something?

MR GYLES: I'm concerned Ms Gerace has had her go. There is one specific topic that has been dealt with. If it's related to that topic, I can understand there might be some right to ask further questions.

MS GERACE: I thought I made it clear. I wanted to ask a question about a matter raised by Mr Kell .

MR KELL: Could I tender the document at tab 308, which is the letter from the Professional Standards Office.

THE COMMISSIONER: The letter at tab 308 from Mr Davoren of the Professional Standards Office to Father Burston of 24 August 1999 will be admitted and marked exhibit 164.

EXHIBIT \#164 LETTER FROM MR DAVOREN OF THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS OFFICE TO FATHER BURSTON OF 24/08/1999 (TAB 308)

THE COMMISSIONER: I will ask Ms Gerace and Mr Baran whether they have any questions.

MR BARAN: I have no questions yet, depending on what Ms Gerace asks.

## <EXAMINATION BY MS GERACE:

MS GERACE: Q. Father, in terms of the evidence you were giving about a conversation with Sister Paula, whenever that conversation took place, did you know generally of the existence of [AL] prior to your conversation with Sister Paula?
A. What do you mean "generally"?
Q. Did you know her name?
A. I don't think so, no.
Q. In terms of the conversation you had with

Sister Paula, are you able to recall the words that Sister Paula told you during that conversation?
A. No.
Q. Are you able to assist in letting us know whether your evidence is that Sister Paula told you that a person had confided in her that she had been abused by Father McAlinden without identifying the person's name, or do you recall her telling you the name of the person?
A. I'm sorry, I can't - I can't recall which of those was true. I can't recall that..

MS GERACE: No further questions.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Gerace. Mr Gyles?
<EXAMINATION BY MR GYLES:
MR GYLES: Q. Father Burston, you were asked some questions about a conversation with Sister Redgrove this morning; do you recall those questions?
A. Yes.
Q. You've said that you don't take issue with the proposition that that conversation may have taken place in 1993 or 1994.
A. Correct.
Q. Or perhaps even 1992?
A. I don't know. I'm not sure.
Q. But certainly your recollection is that it was before the time that you were vicar general?
A. Certainly.
Q. And the time that you were at Centacare?
A. During the time that I was at Centacare, yes.
Q. And that Sister Paula is a friend of yours?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it the case that being asked about that particular conversation has, since you gave evidence last week, jogged your memory about that conversation and enabled you to recall it, at least to some extent?
A. Yes.
Q. It wasn't something that you had directed your mind to before you were asked about it in the last few days in terms of that conversation; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You told both Ms Gerace and Mr Kell that you don't recall the specifics of the conversation, but you have said that you recall that Sister Redgrove had communicated to you a reluctance or even strong reluctance on the part of [AL] to take the complaint as to sexual abuse by McAlinden to the police?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any recollection, again not necessarily drawing on words "I said/She said", do you have a recollection as to any explanation given to you by Sister Redgrove as to why that was, in other words, why there was a reluctance or strong reluctance on the part of [AL] to take the complaint to the police?
A. Yes, I do. Yes, I think so.
Q. Was it because of a concern expressed to you by Sister Redgrove that [AL] did not want her mother to find out about that allegation being made?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. You've said, I think reconstructing, that had this conversation taken place, that you would have told Sister Redgrove that if [AL] wanted to have that matter dealt with, she should pass that on to the appropriate church official?
A. Yes.
Q. Which would either have been the vicar general or the bishop?
A. Yes.
Q. You have no recollection of that happening one way or the other?
A. I don't have an immediate - no.
Q. Can I put another hypothetical to you. If you had said that to Sister Redgrove and she had said, "Look, I don't want to do that myself. Are you able to contact them for me?", can we take it that that is something that you would have done for her? Although I'm not saying you have a recollection of doing it, but would you have been
prepared to make the initial contact, for example, with Monsignor Hart to put him in contact with Sister Redgrove?

MS GERACE: I don't recall there even being any evidence given that that could have even happened. Why does it assist to go down a path that is neither this witness's evidence nor anyone else's evidence of that conversation having taken place.

THE COMMISSIONER: I think Mr Gyles should be permitted to put that hypothetically.

MR GYLES: Q. To be fair to you, what I'm suggesting is the sequence of events was - this is again hypothetical because you're not able to draw upon a recollection beyond the conversation you had with Sister Redgrove, but if you had said to her, "You'11 need to contact the vicar general or the bishop about it", and if there had been a reluctance on her part to make that direct contact herself, you would have facilitated that approach by contacting the vicar general or the bishop to put them in contact with her? A. I presume so, yes.
Q. Is it the case that you have found the process of giving evidence in this Commission stressful?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you find that when you are under stress it can make it more difficult than usual for you to recall historical events or the sequence or timing of historical events?

MR KELL: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: Because it, what, calls into question the evidence you elicited this morning?

MR KELL: What the witness is being asked is nothing to do with outside events; it is just whether giving evidence is stressful. It might be stressful for all sorts of witnesses and, Commissioner, you are in a position to make assessments of any witness. Asking a witness a question along those lines, which is a completely different topic from what I asked, is not something that will assist you. It is not something on which this witness is able to provide any assistance to you and it is an illegitimate form of inquiry of a witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: In the sense that if one - for whatever reason it may be - can't remember something, you don't know, you can't remember it.

MR KELL: It speaks for itself. Every witness who has come before this inquiry may find the situation stressful in the sense that it is very different from ordinary life and that's taken into account when assessing what witnesses are able to say, but they take an oath and they give evidence as to their recollections to the best of their ability.

THE COMMISSIONER: If they can't remember, they say so. Mr Gyles?

MR GYLES: We have a situation where, true it is that every witness in every court may be taken to be under some stress, and --

THE COMMISSIONER: That's part of the system, I think, Mr Gyles.

MR GYLES: It is part of the system. With regard to Father Burston, it no doubt will be said - and I think it's patent from my learned friend's position in terms of his questioning - that his memory will be criticised, but if he perceives, when he is in a position of stress, that it can lead to difficulties with sequencing of historical events or recall and he's found this exercise to be stressful, that must be a potentially relevant thing for you to take into account.

THE COMMISSIONER: I can certainly take into account the stressful situation, Mr Gyles, and indeed the stresses that Father Burston suffered outside the court as well, but I don't know that we can go any further than that.

MR GYLES: If it's not of assistance, I won't pursue that.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles.
MR GYLES: Q. Despite any difficulties you might have had with your memory of historic events and the sequencing of the same, can we take it that you've done your best to be truthful in the evidence you've given before this Commission?
A. Yes.
Q. And so far as police investigations are concerned, have you ever knowingly or intentionally hindered or failed to assist in or cooperate with any police investigation of matters involving the sexual abuse of children, including those relating to McAlinden and Fletcher, or colluded with others to do so?
A. Sorry, that's a long question. The answer is no, I have not hindered in any way.

MR GYLES: Thank you. Those are my questions, but I do propose to tender a medical report of Dr Adam Frost. My learned friend may wish to tender it. I'm happy for that to happen either way.

THE COMMISSIONER: Have you seen this, Mr Kell?
MR KELL: I have, Commissioner, and I'm happy to tender it. It may be that Father Burston could now be excused and we could deal with the tender. It's not intended to ask him questions about the document.

THE COMMISSIONER: Father, thank you for your evidence. I'm sorry you've had to come so many times over such a long period. Thank you for your attendance and you are now excused.

## <THE WITNESS WITHDREW

MR KELL: Commissioner, can I hand up a letter that has been received from the representatives for the diocese, which is a letter dated 24 July 2013 from a Dr Adam Frost.

THE COMMISSIONER: I've read that, thank you.
MR KELL: Commissioner, a document of not identical form but a document directed to another priest was received in evidence in relation to Father Saunders in different circumstances. Having received this document, I am content as counsel assisting for it to be tendered, but $I$ will make some comments about the weight that should be given to it. At the end of the day when there are submissions on the evidence of witnesses, my submission would be that it would be a letter that you would accord very little weight to, and I'11 mention a couple of things now, but I do tender it, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: The letter from Dr Adam Frost in relation to Father Burston will be admitted and marked exhibit 165.

EXHIBIT \#165 LETTER FROM DR ADAM FROST RELATING TO FATHER WILLIAM BURSTON, DATED 24/07/2013

MR KELL: I flag now that there are a number of issues relating to the letter. The first is that it is very much in terms of an impression. If one looks at the second-last paragraph, there is no formal diagnosis of any kind. It's simply the GP indicating "my impression is that the patient has a mild impairment of memory" and, similarly, there is no --

THE COMMISSIONER: And he confirms that, if there is such an impairment, it is probably due to numerous anaesthetics, so that would seem to have some medical basis.

MR KELL: Yes. But it is clear that there is no reference to any baseline testing having been undertaken and you'11 see that from the fourth paragraph. That sort of impacts on the extent to which any GP or medical practitioner is able to give an opinion as to whether there has been any deterioration or change in memory inconsistent with the age of a patient.

THE COMMISSIONER: Still, I note, Mr Kell, that this doctor has treated Father Burston since 1990 and says that he has noticed some memory loss and decreased verbal fluency over the years.

MR KELL: Yes, but by the same token the same doctor is at pains to indicate that he has no baseline testing and that sort of impacts on any assessment to the extent that there is one. He records that he has difficulty in recalling names and completing crosswords, but that's a far cry from some of the topics that the Commission has been looking at. I accept that that is a matter for submission.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you, Mr Kell.
MR KELL: But, also, he does note that father has had several operations to treat complications and he refers to certain documented anaesthetics, but he doesn't provide any expertise in a medical sense of any connection between that and any memory loss. That may well be a matter for
expertise beyond a GP in any event and it's certainly not included in here.

THE COMMISSIONER: It's quite a lot of operations and Dr Frost seems to suggest that it is almost common knowledge - perhaps it is in medicine - that anaesthesia to this degree may impair memory. Thank you, Mr Kell. I'm across it. Thank you.

MR GYLES: While we are alive to this, can I say a couple of things if my learned friend has finished. Dr Frost does talk about having an ageing practice, looking after over 200 nursing home patients. He says he frequently sees memory loss even as a consequence of even a single anaesthetic. He draws upon his personal experience. Dr Frost tells us that there can be formal psychometric testing of this matter, but he says there would be a significant delay in arranging that.

In terms of Father Burston's position, it wasn't until last Wednesday or Thursday that we were aware that there would be a challenge to his memory. It's one thing to be aware that a witness you have may have difficulty recalling events, but that may have been accepted as being truthful and that was the first opportunity we had to deal with this. Given the time available, this is really the best we've been able to do.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR GYLES: All that can be dealt with in due course.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Very well. Mr Kell?

MR KELL: Commissioner, finally, the issue was raised of psychometric testing. I should indicate for the record that given the absence of any baseline testing on Father Burston, which is a matter acknowledged by Dr Frost in his letter, those assisting presently don't consider that such postulated psychometric testing would be of utility. I note that Dr Frost in his own letter doesn't in fact indicate that any steps are being taken to arrange for such psychometric testing.

THE COMMISSIONER: It's very difficult without any testing, say from 40 years ago, or 30 years ago or the
relevant time, to quantify these memory losses in people of advanced years. Thank you, Mr Kell .

MR GYLES: The other point which I think fell from you, Commissioner, is that when it comes to testing memory, in a way, one is dealing as a matter of faith with the person who is undertaking the testing. Had that testing been undertaken and had it shown up as a poor memory, it may well be said that the way in which the witness conducted himself in that - in other words, something that's happening after that process, there may be some criticism of the way in which he has conducted the testing.

THE COMMISSIONER: That's right. Mr Gyles, from my own limited knowledge with ageing parents and so on, so much of the assessment is done on self reporting by the person, so it's very, very difficult for even geriatricians to quantify.

MR GYLES: Exactly.
MR HUNT: I call Elizabeth Doyle.
MR BICKFORD: Ms Doyle relies on section 23.
<ELIZABETH DOYLE, sworn:
[12.34pm]

## <EXAMINATION BY MR HUNT:

MR HUNT: Q. Is your name Elizabeth Doyle?
A. It is.
Q. Can I show you, Ms Doyle, a redacted copy of your statement prepared for this Commission, and a copy for you, Commissioner. Ms Doyle, is that a statement that you prepared at the request of those assisting the Commissioner sworn by you on 2 July 2013 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you doing your best to be truthful and accurate at the time that you swore that statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you ask that the Commissioner takes that into
account as part of your sworn evidence today?
A. Yes.

MR HUNT: It has come to our attention that the appointments document for McAlinden has not been tendered, and I propose to tender it through Ms Doyle. I'll just ask some short questions on that topic.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt.
MR HUNT: Q. Would you just look at volume 7, which is there in front of you, and could you open that to tab 517. It should be towards the back. In the course of your duties - I'll just summarise briefly - you've had different job titles, but effectively since 1993 you were variously either the secretary or the assistant to Bishop Clarke, Bishop Malone through the entire period of his episcopy, and are now the executive assistant to Bishop Bill Wright? A. Yes.
Q. Among your duties have you, from time to time, needed to make notations or look to files that hold various priests' statements of appointments?
A. Yes.
Q. Is the statement of appointment held in a priest's general personnel file?
A. As in these statements?
Q. Yes.
A. Records - no.
Q. Where are they held?
A. They are all held in an arch-lever file together.
Q. So the global records of any priest currently incardinated to the diocese, their appointments are held in the one spot?
A. Yes, there is one arch-lever folder and they are all filed alphabetically.
Q. That document there, is that a statement of appointments in relation to Denis McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there any of your writing on the second page of that?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you read aloud what writing is yours?
A. Yes. It says:
[Advised] by [Archbishop] Hickey (Perth) on 1/12/05 that Denis McAlinden had passed away late last night (30/11/05) of a heart attack. He is to be buried on 8/12/05.

MR HUNT: I tender the statement of appointment behind tab 517.

THE COMMISSIONER: The appointments document in relation to Denis McAlinden behind tab 517 will be admitted and marked exhibit 166.

## EXHIBIT \#166 APPOINTMENTS DOCUMENT IN RELATION TO DENIS McALINDEN (TAB 517)

MR HUNT: Q. Before you put it away, I'm going to ask you about one other piece of handwriting that might be yours. Do you see over on the lower left-hand margin of page 2 there is something that says "Will Yes 3/7/96"; is that also your handwriting?
A. No, that's not.

MR HUNT: I tender the statement of Elizabeth Doyle.
THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Doyle's statement will be admitted and marked exhibit 167.

EXHIBIT \#167 STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH DOYLE, DATED 2/07/2013
MR HUNT: Q. Briefly, I want to ask you some questions about the typing ability of various clergy that you have worked with one way and another. Is it the case that Bishop Leo Clarke could type, to your recollection?
A. My knowledge is that he could simply because I'm pretty sure that prior to him coming to our diocese, his appointment as bishop of the diocese, at some point he had been secretary to - I don't know if it's the bishop or archbishop in Melbourne diocese.
Q. And Monsignor Hart you suspect can't type, or -A. I think I know that for a fact - well, back then anyway. I don't know about now.
Q. When you say "back then", when he was vicar general -A. That's right.
Q. -- to Bishop Clarke you didn't take the view that Monsignor Hart was a typist?
A. Correct.
Q. Father Bill Burston?
A. Yes, Father Bill could type. How efficient I don't know; he may have only used two fingers but he could type.
Q. What about Bishop Michael Malone?
A. No.
Q. I want to take you to a couple of documents. I want to turn up one bit of your statement. Just bear with me a moment. I think your position is that whilst you accept that you may have either read correspondence or typed correspondence about allegations of clergy abusing people back in the 1990s, you now don't recall that. You don't have a specific recollection of that; is that the position? A. No, not specifically of that particular issue.
Q. Would you look at volume 3. Volume 7 can be put away now. Would you look behind tab 216. Your general practice when you type a document is that you type something below the signature area if somebody else is going to sign the document, indicating the initials of the person for whom you've typed it and then a slash and then "ED", indicating that you're the typist. Is that generally your practice?
A. Generally, yes.
Q. Would you look at tab 216 and see the whole of that document.
A. Yes.
Q. Does that seem to be a letter written by Bishop Clarke?
A. Yes.
Q. If you adopted your usual practice, from the face of that, that would seem to be an example of a document that wasn't typed by you.
A. Yes.
Q. And either typed by the bishop himself or by some other secretarial assistant that didn't have the same practice that you did; is that right?
A. Yes, but it may have been typed by me, because --
Q. Why do you say that?
A. I say that because I think when I first started in that role, having come from a 20 -year career as a travel agent and not really typing letters like this, that wasn't part of my role then, I probably wasn't aware that one should probably put a reference on the bottom of it. So I guess there could have been some letters that I may have typed prior to starting to put a reference on the bottom.
Q. Given that you commenced employment with the diocese as a secretary to Bishop Clarke on 4 January 1993, and that letter is dated 5 March 1993, it represents, in your fairly early period, adapting from being a travel agent to doing something else.
A. Yes .
Q. I'11 just show you a couple of other documents. Would you look at tab 243 in that same volume. Is the character of the document there - first of all, is it a document that's dated 10 May 1995?
A. Yes.
Q. Is the document that's there a letter from Bishop Clarke to Bishop Pedro Bantique in the Philippines?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see down the bottom there is "+LMC/ed"?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that suggest to you that you typed that letter?
A. Yes, I would have typed that.
Q. You accept the character of that letter is a letter that deals with at least "issues" in relation to McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you now turn to the next document, which is tab 244? That's a letter 23 May to the apostolic pro nuncio from Bishop Clarke. Does that also seem to have been typed by you?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you go, also, to tab 262. Is that also a letter that you would seem to have typed for Leo Clarke that was addressed on 19 October 1995 to McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. The correspondence that I've been taking you through in the last three tabs is effectively the period towards the end of Bishop Leo Clarke's episcopacy.
A. Yes.
Q. Can you now, remembering that type of correspondence, say what, if any, discussion there was in terms of Bishop Michael, who was then the coadjutor bishop, being involved in those discussions with Bishop Leo, to your know1 edge?
A. No, I can't say, basically because - I mean, they may have had discussions about it, but primarily because of the layout of our office, the offices where the coadjutor bishop, Bishop Michael, was and where Bishop Leo was were outside the area where my office was and actually Bishop Leo was upstairs so they could well have had conversations that I wasn't aware of.
Q. Could you go back and look at tab 256. I just want to ask you some questions. I don't know whether this is a document that you typed or not. It's minutes of a deans' meeting, Wednesday, 2 August 1995. Can you say whether it was within your duties in 1995 to type up minutes taken by somebody else of deans' meetings?
A. I can't remember, but I could probably say that I may have well done that.
Q. If it's minutes rather than correspondence, would you do the "/ED" at the bottom of something like minutes?
A. No.
Q. So the fact that that doesn't have any note on the bottom doesn't mean that you didn't type it?
A. Correct.
Q. Can you say whether you think it's likely that you typed this document?
A. It could be, because I'm assuming that this is the document that there's been some question over the word "legislation".
Q. Indeed.
A. I've been thinking about that, and there is every possibility that I could have typed those minutes, because they would have been given to me, especially if

Monsignor Hart had taken those minutes, because his writing was absolutely impossible to decipher, so $I$ could well have typed them and typed an incorrect word in there, because I didn't know what the other word meant.
Q. Looking to the personnel who were at that meeting, there was Bishop Clarke, coadjutor Bishop Malone, Monsignor Hart, who was then the VG, and various deans.
A. Yes.
Q. Is it your best view that it would likely have been the vicar general who took minutes back then?
A. If he was present at that meeting - it was 1995 - and the fact that he was living on site where our office was, it would make sense that he would have taken them and then just given them to me, because he was nearby, for me to communicate with about the minutes.
Q. Can you help the Commissioner with this? If you look at the very bottom, you'11 see that these were minutes that were actually signed off - even though the meeting relates to an August meeting, Bishop Clarke signed off the minutes on 3 October 1995.
A. Yes.
Q. Looking at his signature there, and then going back up to page 2 and the second item where there is a strike-through of the word "legislation", and some figure above that, can you say anything about that figure from your knowledge of correspondence signatories and the like back then?
A. I mean, it looks like it could be Bishop Leo's, but I couldn't say 100 per cent.
Q. Were you not the typist of this, could you nominate who else back in that sort of time, between August and October 1995, would likely have been the typist?
A. Me.
Q. It would have been you?
A. Yes.
Q. In other words, it was too late for it to be Joan Boyle --
A. Oh, yes.
Q. -- who was your predecessor and too early for somebody
like Maree Lawrie to be involved; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So you think it's highly likely that it was you?
A. Was me, yes.
Q. You think it was likely that it was Monsignor Hart who did the writing and, if so, a word that was not regularly known to you, you might not have been able to make it out. A. Yes.
Q. You've been following the evidence. Do you have a view what that word was meant to be?
A. Look, I don't really know, but I guess having heard, yes, what I've heard, I would, at a guess, say it was laicisation.
Q. Given the length of the word and what you've heard about the topic of conversation and the like?
A. Yes, and that's why I would have probably put "legislation" because I wouldn't have known what laicisation was.
Q. Did you come to know what laicisation was back in that 1995 period? In other words, was it something discussed within the chancery?
A. No.
Q. In your stat dec you indicate - I just want to move to a different topic now - that you can't remember who coined the term "special issues" within the chancery?
A. Yes.
Q. No idea at all?
A. Oh, no, because I never referred to those particular, what I would call confidential files, as "special issues".
Q. That was a term that others used, but you would use the term "confidential files", would you?
A. No, we probably used the term, or I would have used the term "bad" and "good", to distinguish between them.
Q. So a priest's normal personnel file you would call a good file?
A. Yes.
Q. And what others might have called "special issues"
files you would call the "bad" files?
A. (Witness nods head).
Q. Where were the bad files kept back in the 1990s?
A. Oh, in the 1990s, I didn't even know if there were any, but if there were, they were all kept in one cabinet in the - well, where the normal - the good - what I would then consider the good files were all kept. All files were in one cabinet. My belief is that as the confidential or bad files were - what's the word - established, that at one point they were then put into a separate file. So if you had a priest who had a good and a bad file, they would be one behind the other - the good file in the front and the bad file or the confidential file behind.
Q. Not quarantined off - the same area but just separate files within the same --
A. I'm sorry, you are talking 1995?
Q. Yes.
A. No, 1995 I didn't even know what existed. All I knew was that there was a cabinet with priests' files in it.
Q. The kind of correspondence that I've been showing you that you typed, and I assume the bishop signed and it went off in the mail --
A. Yes.
Q. -- back in those days, what kind of copy would have been kept?
A. Oh, just exactly - like, that would have been - what's in here --
Q. Were they carbon copies back then?
A. 1995? No, we had a computer then, so they would have been printed off the computer.
Q. Where would you file the sorts of things that I've been showing you to Bishop Bantique or the apostolic nuncio? Where would the copies go? Would they be in a personnel file or in a bad file or --
A. I don't know because I didn't file anything back then.
Q. Who did the filing back then?
A. I'm assuming that would have been just been the bishop. Whether the vicar general did or not, I don't know - the vicar general at the time, I don't know.
Q. I will use "secretarial", although I know your role has grown in importance, so I don't want to --
A. I wouldn't say that.
Q. I don't want to have to keep changing the title. When did it become an executive assistant secretarial function to file things away within the chancery?
A. That would have been in Bishop Michael's time when He became - I don't know exactly when, but some time during his episcopy is when I started to file.

MR HUNT: I'm going to move to a different topic so that might be a convenient time, Commissioner, if that is convenient.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, very well, Mr Hunt. 2 o'clock, thank you.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

## UPON RESUMPTION:

MR HUNT: I recall Ms Doyle.
Q. I said I was going to move to a new topic, but I'm not going to. Look at volume 3, tab 250. Looking at the marks on the bottom of that letter, does that seem to you to be a letter that you typed for Monsignor Hart dated 20 June 1995 to Reverend Castillo in the Philippines?
A. Yes.
Q. Do we gather in that period that you're likely to have typed all Vicar General Hart's correspondence?
A. Yes. During which period, sorry?
Q. The 1995-type period.
A. I probably would have, yes.
Q. I think the position is you would describe the relationship between Bishop Clarke and Monsignor Hart as being fairly close?
A. I would have thought so, yes.
Q. And self-contained in terms of you would imagine there was a fair bit of information exchanged between the two of them that, say, you wouldn't get to know as the personal assistant?
A. Yes. Whatever would have been exchanged between them, I was not privy to.
Q. Look at behind tab 265 for completeness in that same volume. Do you see a letter there, 2 November 1995? Looking at the markings on that, are you satisfied that it is likely that you typed that correspondence for Bishop Malone in the last day of him being the coadjutor bishop? A. Yes.
Q. I'11 just show you another document that is not in the bundle. There is a copy for the witness and a copy for the Commissioner. Is that a letter that you typed for Bishop Clarke on 18 October 1995 addressed to Mr Lauer, Commissioner of Police?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember the circumstances of typing that letter? Had you had any involvement in the matters that were the subject matter of that letter before typing it?
A. Can I just read it?
Q. Yes, of course you can. Take your time.
A. Yes, I'm aware of what that refers to.
Q. Were you aware back then? Before you typed that letter, had there been discussion in those few days after Father Ryan's arrest within the chancery about that issue? A. No. No.
Q. Do you remember knowing before you typed that letter that there had been police involvement?
A. Yes, because I was actually the person who the police called on the day that Vince Ryan was arrested.
Q. Can you now say, aided by reading that letter, whether Bishop Clarke himself had personal contact with the police as a result of their interest in Ryan?
A. Do you mean before this or after this?
Q. Yes.
A. Before it?
Q. Before the typing of the letter?
A. No.

MR HUNT: I tender the letter.
THE COMMISSIONER: The letter from Bishop Clarke to Mr Lauer dated 18 October 1995 will be admitted and marked exhibit 168.

## EXHIBIT \#168 LETTER FROM BISHOP CLARKE TO THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, MR LAUER, DATED 18/10/1995

MR HUNT: Q. Ms Doyle, could you look at page 5 of your statement. You can close that volume. You'll be glad to know we've finished, at least for my purposes, with that volume. Question 5 on page 5 invited you to give details of any instructions, oral or written, given to you during the episcopies of each of Bishop Clarke, Bishop Malone and/or Bishop Wright broadly in relation to the topic of cooperation with police; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. In paragraph 33 you say:

> I was not given any instructions in relation to this question during Bishop Clarke's episcopy.

And you are nodding? You are adopting that?
A. Sorry, yes, that's right.
Q. Is it the position that you were never asked to do anything for the bishop relative to police inquiries during the period that he was bishop?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it a reasonable proposition that, had you been, because of the unusual nature, that's something that is likely to have stayed in memory?
A. Had I been, yes.
Q. In paragraph 34 in relation to Bishop Malone you say this:

Bishop Malone gave me an oral instruction
that I was to assist the Police with
whatever the Police asked for. I cannot
recall actual words he used, but it was
words to the effect of:
"If the Police want access to files, give it to them."
A. Yes.
Q. Was that then your practice?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I ask you this: doing your best when in time did Bishop Malone give you instructions at that time? He became bishop in 1995 - until his retirement?
A. Look, I can't remember the exact date, but I'm just trying to get in my head what building we were in, because we moved offices. We moved from Maitland to Hamilton. Then when we were in Hamilton, we then changed offices within the Hamilton site, and I feel it was before we moved to our existing - where we are now - our existing office. So it would have been - that was in 2006, so that's all I can say, some time in that period before we moved. I know it was in the - our first building that we moved into.
Q. So it was in Hamilton but the first offices at Hamilton?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're clear that it was after the move from Maitland?
A. Oh, yes.
Q. When was that?
A. That was - I think we moved early March 1995 - yes, 1995, because Bishop Michael didn't actually have an office in Maitland.
Q. Can you remember now what the context was of Bishop Michael raising that with you? One would assume it's not the kind of thing that he would say, "I'm going to start to open my own mail now, Elizabeth, and by the way if the police want anything, give it to them." Can you remember what the moving event was that meant he was talking to you about the police?
A. Yes, I'm pretty sure it was following the arrest of Vince Ryan because I can remember the police coming in at some point - I don't know when, but at some point asking like, wanting the Vince Ryan file.
Q. Can you remember whether that was Detective Grant Troy Grant?
A. Yes, I remember him. Yes, it was him.
Q. So you know it was him, but you can't say exactly when, time-wise?
A. No.
Q. But from the time you were dealing with Troy Grant, the instruction was relative to just Vince Ryan, or -A. It was general, because as I say, I mean I had had it was all - police/sexual abuse was all so foreign to me, so when the police came or rang - I don't even remember whether they rang or came in - and wanted access to Vince Ryan's file I remember the bishop - it was probably around that time that he said, "Yep, give it to them and whatever the police want."
Q. Could you look at volume 5. I'm going to show you a document that is not your document, but I suspect relates to you. Could you look up tab 357.

For the assistance of those at the bar table, the document that I'm taking the witness to relates to Detective Senior Constable Flipo's evidence, and I think the entry that I'm taking the witness to correlates with annexure B to exhibit 83, page 5, down the bottom, if that assists the parties.

Do you have tab 357 now, Ms Doyle?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you see a note there. Perhaps you would be good enough to read out of what you can read of the handwritten notes below that typewritten document?
A. "Hasn't been", I assume an abbreviation, "Newcastle/Maitland for 10 years. Diocese for some time. Not sure where he is. Elizabeth - Maitland diocese OS." I assume overseas - "address of relative".
Q. That seems to be a note that on the evidence was written in 2002 or 2003 by Senior Constable Flipo. Does that ring a bell?
A. No, it doesn't. Well, when I say it doesn't ring a bell, that I actually spoke to her, but having heard her evidence.
Q. You don't have an independent memory --
A. No.
Q. -- of her speaking to you?
A. No, I don't.
Q. But you accept, given the content, first of all, in terms of people with the first name of Elizabeth at the chancery around that time, it's highly likely to have been you that she was speaking to?
A. Yes.
Q. The inquiries that came in that were either bishop's type inquiries or more detailed personnel inquiries were likely to have been directed to you; is that right?
A. Personnel inquiries, from the police, do you mean?
Q. Yes.
A. My memory is that $I$ do recall speaking to different police over time, but most of them would always ask to speak to the bishop and if the bishop wasn't there, if the vicar general was there, I would say the vicar general was
there. They would either speak to them or if no-one was there, they'd say - I'd say, "How about I have them call you back?" So that's what would happen. I'm kind of surprised by this, because I don't recall any other police officer asking me - asking me the question, other than --
Q. The material that's relayed there, assuming that it was you that relayed that material, would that material have been sourced in the personnel file of McAlinden? A. I can't remember - having heard all of that from Detective Flipo, I can't remember whether I went to the file. I doubt I probably would have. I would have probably asked whoever was there - the bishop obviously wasn't there, I'm assuming, because I think the other evidence showed that I said I would check with him and call her back, so I'd either gone to the vicar general, if he was there at the time, and asked him.
Q. So it's likely possibly to have been either Father Saunders or Father Burston; is that --
A. Yes, they would have been the vicar general then.
Q. Do you remember generally, either relative to this incident or at that time, a number of inquiries about the whereabouts of McAlinden?
A. Not specifically McAlinden. As I say, when the police called, they just said to me, "I need to speak to the bishop" and most of the time I would put them through, or he'd call them back.
Q. Priests that are incardinated to the diocese but aren't on the books in the sense that they are working in a parish in the diocese, where is address material stored, or where was, back in the 2000s, early 2000s, address material stored for priests who were away, whether they were on long service leave and so on?
A. We would have had - just like a list that probably probably 2000 would have been on a computer by then. We probably had a database. That's just my recollection for that time.
Q. Do you remember having occasion to update the database about McAlinden when his whereabouts became known?
A. Look, I may have, but I can't remember.
Q. Could you get volume 3 out again, please, Ms Doyle. I just want to ask you about a couple of other documents
from the 1990s. Would you turn up tab 238. That would seem to be another letter that you typed for Bishop Clarke addressed to McAlinden and dated 8 November 1994.
A. Yes .
Q. Is that broadly the topic of that correspondence correspondence that you broadly remember now, that is, correspondence with church officials and McAlinden whilst he was in the Philippines?
A. I mean, I haven't read it totally, but I don't remember typing that. I don't remember that issue at all.
Q. Take your time in reading it if you want to.
A. Okay.
Q. But you accept from the markings that it would seem to be --
A. Me.
Q. -- typed by you?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you look at the next one in the bundle as well, which is a letter of the same date. Would that appear to be typed by you?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember that one?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Did Bishop Clarke ever discuss this topic with you, the topic of it being McAlinden's desire to become incardinated, or at least work in the Philippines?
A. No.
Q. Can I ask you this: when Bishop Malone arrived as the coadjutor bishop, I think you said initially when he first arrived he didn't even have an office when the offices were at Maitland?
A. He didn't officially start as coadjutor his duties until we moved to Hamilton.
Q. Bishop Clarke and Monsignor Hart were a fairly tight unit?
A. Sorry, Bishop Clarke and --
Q. And Bishop Clarke and Monsignor Hart as the vicar
general?
A. I would have thought so.
Q. Did it seem to you that Bishop Malone wasn't in the inner circle with Bishop Clarke and Monsignor Hart in terms of the finer tunings of the workings of the diocese? Is that a fair proposition when he first arrived?
A. Yes, it's probably a fair proposition, but then my memory is that Bishop Michael didn't actually spend a lot of time in the office when he was the coadjutor bishop. He was actually out in the parish a lot, so he wasn't very often in the office anyway.
Q. Did you form the view that he was excluded - whether it was because he was out in the parishes or by choice - by Bishop Clarke and Monsignor Hart, that Bishop Michael was excluded from some of the decisions and machinations within the diocese?
A. Yes, probably thinking about it, yes, he probably was but again because of the layout of our office, I don't know what conversations he may have had with Bishop Leo, because Bishop Leo's office was upstairs, Bishop Michael's was downstairs, the vicar general's was downstairs and so was mine. The ground floor was set out in such a way that any of those could have gone upstairs and we wouldn't have known where they were. They could have easily had conversations.
Q. Often the test of what level of communication has gone on is made out when somebody else is missing from the equation, so when Bishop Clarke retired, did Bishop Malone rely on you to understand how various things worked in the chancery?
A. What I did know, I assisted him with, but a lot of things I didn't know about.
Q. Did it seem to you, accepting the limitations of the layout and so on, that Bishop Malone hadn't been told about a number of important things when he started, particularly to do with the issues about McAlinden and the like?
A. Well, I don't really know, because I didn't even know the issue with McAlinden anyway. Can I just say, too, I know that the Vince Ryan thing was a surprise to him.
Q. Was a surprise to?
A. Bishop Michael.
Q. He came back from leave and that had all just happened; is that your recollection?
A. Yes. I think he was due back, you know, within a couple of days or something of when the arrest happened.
Q. I want to explore what you just said about McAlinden. You obviously knew that there was some kind of issue with McAlinden because of the tenor of this correspondence, that is, that he was unsuitable to be incardinated and the like? A. Yes, I knew there was something, but I didn't really know what it was.
Q. When was the first time that you understood that there was a cloud over McAlinden that related to impermissible behaviour with children?
A. I think it was probably - I don't know the exact period, but it was during Bishop Michael's time when I think more things started to come to the surface about that, and I guess I probably - there was correspondence that may have had - I can't remember precisely, but may have had sexual abuse actually mentioned in correspondence and --
Q. And - I didn't want to cut you off, keep going.
A. I was going to say that I think the most of what I learned about McAlinden was what I read in the Newcastle Herald.
Q. Things coming to light or whatever expression you used a moment ago, did they include police interest?
A. Well, I don't know, because when the police would contact, I don't know. They didn't say what it was about, so it could have quite easily - those phone calls I took could have quite easily been about him.
Q. When Bishop Michael commenced being bishop, personnel files and good and bad files, if they existed at that stage, were they within the bishop's office when Bishop Michael started, in other words, in that early period when he had just taken over from Bishop Clarke?
A. Yes, there was a filing cabinet in there that had the personnel files in it, but I don't know, at that point of when he took over, what was there regarding I guess if you want to call it the bad or the confidential files because I wasn't privy, I didn't have access to any of that before that.
Q. Accepting that Bishop Malone could access files in his office if you weren't there, did he ever ask you to get McAlinden's personnel file out from time to time?
A. Oh, look, he may have, but I don't really have any recollection of him asking me that.
Q. So you don't recollect it, but you can't exclude it; is that --
A. No, that's right.
Q. What do you say about the existence of a briefcase with secret files in Bishop Clarke's possession?
A. I had heard at some point about that. I don't know who told me or when I heard, but I had heard about it, but I myself was not aware of it.
Q. Can I get you to refine that. Had you heard about it at the time that Bishop Clarke was still the bishop?
A. No, no, this was after.
Q. You heard about it after the event?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ever come to know about Bishop Malone being handed secret files or a briefcase with secret files by Bishop Clarke?
A. Yes, I had heard and, again, I don't know who told me and where I heard it, but I had heard and I was aware that there was a handover of a briefcase.
Q. Are we to understand that you had heard that that would be somebody within the chancery, or at Hamilton generally?
A. I can't remember. I really can't remember. Chances are it was probably someone at Hamilton.
Q. Would you now look at volume 3, tab 206. I just want to have you review that material. Just scan the attachments if you would. You don't have to read it in detail, as long as you've satisfied yourself broadly as to what's there. Reading the covering email and then looking at the attachments, does that correspondence seem to be some material that you provided to Detective Sergeant Little on 18 January 2012 at the direction of Bishop Bill Wright?
A. Yes. I've obviously done it, sent the email.
Q. Does it seem to you that it was somebody else's job to obtain the material that's attached, that there has been some - apparently as a result of Detective Sergeant Little being in touch with Bishop Wright, that some kind of searches have been made from some records and some material has been provided to police?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that consistent with what you describe on page 5, paragraph 35, on that topic of instructions that you received about assistance with the police, that Bishop Wright had also given you an oral instruction to assist the police with whatever the police asked for. Do you see that in your statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that an instruction that Bishop Wright gave you early on when he became bishop?
A. Yes, I believe it was, and I think I just happened to say to him, "Look, you know, when Bishop Michael was here, he gave me instruction to give the police whatever they were looking for when they rang up or came in. I'm assuming I still carry on like that." He went, "Absolutely." .

MR HUNT: I tender tab 206.
THE COMMISSIONER: The material behind tab 206 will be admitted and marked exhibit 169.

## EXHIBIT \#169 EMAIL FROM ELIZABETH DOYLE DATED 18/1/2012 PLUS ATTACHMENTS (TAB 206)

MR HUNT: Q. Would you turn up volume 5 again, Ms Doyle. We've finished with that one again. Tab 353; do you have 353 open in front of you?
A. I do.
Q. You'll see there that there is an email which you sent on 5 July 2002 to John Davoren?
A. Yes.
Q. You understood at that stage that John Davoren was working with the Professional Standards Office?
A. Yes.
Q. There is some material that you have provided him in
relation to McAlinden, his date of birth and a couple of addresses, some of which has been redacted out of that copy. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. The writing, where it's saying: Advised Angela/Professional Standards Office "not too sure if" there is a pseudonym - "is his sister", apparently the initials "ED" and the date 5/7/02. That's your notation?
A. It is.
Q. You'11 see there's another note which also appears to be in your writing and initialised by you; is that right? A. Yes.
Q. That says:

This info adv --
which I assume is your advice -- -
to Jackie Flipo, Charlestown Detectives ...
Then a phone number and then the date of 26/9/2002.
A. Yes.
Q. Seeing that material, does that seem to make sense of the other note that I took you to earlier about where Detective Senior Constable Flipo seems to have made a note which is consistent with having been in contact with you? A. It does.
Q. Having seen that material, whether it's that same contact or another one with her, you're satisfied that you did provide two known addresses to Flipo in relation to McAlinden?
A. Yes, I know I would have done that, because I would not have written that there if I hadn't.

MR HUNT: I tender that.
THE COMMISSIONER: Tab 353, that is, the email from the witness, Ms Doyle, to Mr Davoren, with the handwritten notations will be exhibit 170.

EXHIBIT \#170 EMAIL FROM MS DOYLE TO MR DAVOREN, DATED 5/7/2002
(TAB 353)
MR HUNT: Q. Having refreshed your memory now about affirmatively providing material both to the Professional Standards Office about McAlinden's whereabouts and then to Flipo, did you consider yourself under a continuing obligation limited to the police that if you had come to some more material about McAlinden's whereabouts, you would have considered yourself obliged to contact the police about that?
A. No, I probably would not have.
Q. Did you have any system for keeping track of, say, Flipo's details or any other police that were wanting to know about McAlinden within the chancery records?
A. Nothing other than his own file.

MR HUNT: That's the examination-in-chief.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Roser?
MR ROSER: No.
MR WILLIS: No questions.
MS NEEDHAM: No questions.
<EXAMINATION BY MR HARBEN:
MR HARBEN: $Q$. Do you have your statement there?
A. I do.
Q. The portion of your statement that you were taken to on page 5, paragraph 5 , sets out what happened during the reign of various bishops. Do we take it that, because of the difference between paragraph 34 and paragraph 33, the change that you refer to was a significant change in terms of instruction to you?
A. Yes.
Q. And the effect of that significant change was to ensure that if police wanted access to anything, they were to be given it?
A. Yes.
Q. And Bishop Malone made that clear to you?
A. He did.
Q. I take it that, over the years that he was bishop, that cooperation continued during all of that time.
A. Yes .
Q. In relation to the document that you were taken to in volume 3 - do you have volume 3 there, tab 206 ?
A. Yes.
Q. That's an email prepared by you?
A. Yes.
Q. And sent by you?
A. Yes.
Q. You'11 see that you were asked to look at or briefly to scan the documents that appear immediately behind it.
A. Yes .
Q. Each of those documents are not listed as attachments, are they?
A. To the email?
Q. Yes.
A. No.
Q. Just looking at the email itself, without having the benefit of whatever material followed that page, you would not be able to identify any particular document that was attached to the email, would you?
A. No.
Q. And that was consistent with your practice, that from time to time you scanned things, for example, and attached them to emails?
A. Yes.
Q. Or, if something came in, sent to you on the computer, you may from time to time attach and send that on as well? A. Yes .
Q. It would not be the case, would it, that on each occasion you would set out individually attachments, but from time to time you would do what you have done on this occasion - give a general description of an attachment? A. Yes, that's right.

MR HARBEN: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Harben. Mr Gyles?
<EXAMINATION BY MR GYLES:
MR GYLES: Q. Apropos of Mr Harben's questions, if you were, by way of email, passing on a document which made specific reference to a document as opposed to a more general description, that where you have chosen to be specific, that might indicate that you were only passing on the particular document referred to. Would that be a fair thing to say?
A. Would you just repeat that?
Q. My learned friend has been putting to you that where, in the connection with the 18 January 2012 email --
A. Yes.
Q. Where you say "Please find attached documents"?
A. Documents, yes.
Q. You say that from time to time you would, in passing those documents, not identify the particular documents referred to?
A. Correct.
Q. Can we take it that there are other occasions where, when asked to provide information on by email, you would set out the specific documents in question?
A. Yes.
Q. And where you chose to do the latter, ie, to set out the specific documents, then presumably you would have referred to whichever documents you were passing on?
A. Yes.

MR HARBEN: I object to that. That asks for a specific response to a general question, which, with respect, this witness can't answer. She can be shown a document or an email as an example, but to classify something with specificity, as is being attempted, by the general proposition in the absence of such identification, is meaningless.

THE COMMISSIONER: What do you think, Mr Hunt?

MR HUNT: I'll reserve what I think, but my submission is that both Mr Harben and Mr Gyles have had some success in asking this in general terms. I suspect that there might be something they both want to ask about specifically which will have to wait for another day and in a different context because of the subject matter. If it's to go to specific documents apart from this document, it's probably best left to that other forum.

THE WITNESS: Am I allowed to say something?
MR HUNT: I would rather the witness not volunteer anything at this point.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
Mr Harben, I'll allow the question and note that in fact Ms Doyle answered in the affirmative in any event.

MR GYLES: I'11 move on from that topic. I wouldn't want to upset Mr Harben.
Q. You were asked some questions about tab 353 and that was your handwritten note of your communication with Detective Flipo; do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. My learned friend Mr Hunt asked you a question whether you regarded yourself as under a continuing obligation to inform the police if you became aware of information regarding McAlinden's current whereabouts; do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. I think your answer was "No." Can we take it that if at any time you or, to your observations, Bishop Malone had been asked by the police to provide the best information that you had as to McAlinden's current whereabouts, then that information would have been provided?
A. Yes.
Q. And that would be consistent with Bishop Malone's instruction to you so far as your giving information? A. Yes.
Q. And consistent with your observation as to how Bishop Malone himself dealt with matters of that kind?
A. Yes.

MR GYLES: No further questions.
<EXAMINATION BY MR BICKFORD:
MR BICKFORD: Q. You were asked some questions at the beginning about your position with respect to previous allegations against members of the clergy, being child sexual abuse allegations?
A. Yes.
Q. Do I understand your evidence to be that you couldn't remember the specifics; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you gave some further evidence about not remembering what was happening with Father McAlinden in the early days, if I can put it that way; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. You were taken to a number of documents. I'm sorry to do this to you, but can you look in volume 3, and I want to ask you some quick questions in relation to those documents. We might do them in chronological order. So in volume 3, perhaps if you turn up tab 238 to begin with. Do you have that document before you?
A. Yes.
Q. Just have a quick read to yourself and tell me when you're finished.
A. Yes, I'm finished.
Q. Contained within that document are there the words "child sexual abuse" at all?
A. No.
Q. Is the word "child" or "abuse" mentioned at all?
A. No.
Q. Turn to the next document, tab 239, a quick read again if you could.

MR HUNT: If it assists my friend, I'm quite prepared to concede that none of the documents I took the witness to speaks specifically of child sexual abuse or allegations in that fashion.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt.
MR BICKFORD: That's sensible. I won't need to take the witness to any others in that case.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Bickford.
MR BICKFORD: I thank my learned friend for that.
Q. Can I just ask you this question, and you can probably just close that volume for the time being: you were asked some questions about the special issues file; do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. I think, as part of your evidence, you referred to the good and the bad priests' files; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Your primary role within the diocese has always been in administration, hasn't it?
A. Yes .
Q. As a person in administration, you brought to the diocese administrative skills?
A. Yes .
Q. Part of that was to be involved in filing systems; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And from time to time you would create filing systems;
is that right?
A. Yes, the systems were in place, but we would try to improve upon that, and even today we're still trying to improve upon the systems.
Q. Still trying to improve on those systems?
A. Yes.
Q. At some point I think during Bishop Malone's term as the bishop, he asked you to make a division between the files; is that right - that is, the personal priests' files?
A. Yes, that's right. My memory is that in the normal or in the good files, what we now probably refer to as the
personnel files, that there was one file that would have contained every piece of correspondence that had come in or out for those particular priests. Then at one point, he asked me to make up a second file where there was documentation within those files that perhaps was - well, was considered confidential, so that they would then be separated.
Q. When you say "confidential", it concerned matters involving misconduct to do with priests?
A. Misconduct --
Q. Allegations of misconduct?
A. Allegations of misconduct.
Q. Not just allegations of sexual abuse, for instance?
A. No, no. They could contain anything from that to perhaps where a parishioner within a parish may at some point have brought a concern to the bishop around perhaps what they considered was not good governance in the parish.
Q. Something like that might go in the bad file as it was referred to?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was, so far as you were aware, an administrative decision to make it more convenient to be able to retrieve or store documents; is that right?
A. Yes, that was my understanding, just for ease of access, really, that everything connected with specific things were together.
Q. It didn't have anything to do with a specific instruction from the bishop as to the storage of secret files, for instance, did it?
A. No, no.
Q. You've had a number of title changes during the 20 years that you've worked for the diocese?
A. Yes.
Q. From secretary, office manager, personal assistant to executive assistant. Is it fair to say essentially your role has remained largely the same?
A. Largely, but of course in 20 years, it has just evolved with what - that particular role in any industry, I guess, how that would evolve.
Q. But it has always been from the beginning, and it is today, your responsibility to provide administrative assistance to the bishop?
A. Yes .
Q. And administrative assistance to the vicars general at the relevant time?
A. Yes. That's probably changing slightly now because we have a new staff member to assist me, who is doing work for the vicar general, but up until fairly recently, yes.
Q. You've never been given the responsibility by any of the three bishops that you've worked under to manage complaints about members of the clergy, have you?
A. No.
Q. And it has never been delegated to you, for instance, by any of the vicars general to manage complaints about members of the clergy?
A. No.
Q. You've never assumed responsibility in terms of managing complaints about members of the clergy?
A. No.

MR BICKFORD: Thank you, Commissioner. Those are my questions.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR HUNT:

MR HUNT: Q. Just one matter of clarification and then there are a couple of other issues. Have you got tab 206 in front of you.
A. Tab 206?
Q. Tab 206 again, if you would. I think in summary I suggested that somebody else within the chancery might have searched or compiled documents. Would you look at the page that has 413 down the bottom, in other words, the page immediately behind the covering email.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see about the middle of that diary note:

I have had some discussion with Liz around this matter.

And indications of searching for cheque butts?
A. Yes .
Q. Would that seem to refer to you?
A. Yes, it was me.
Q. Just for completeness, do you remember doing part of this exercise?
A. I do remember that. I remember being asked, yes.
Q. That's all I wanted to ask you about that.

Mr Bickford and I have both taken you to examples of outgoing mail during the 1995 period in particular. If mail was marked "confidential" for the attention of the bishop and it came during Bishop Clarke's episcopy, what was his practice about whether you would open his confidential mail, or whether he would?
A. I didn't open any of his mail.
Q. At all?
A. No.
Q. Confidential or not?
A. No, nothing.
Q. Accepting the elliptical nature of some of the correspondence and perhaps euphemisms in some of the outgoing correspondence, are you able to, thinking about it carefully now, indicate when it was that you first understood in fact that there were known concerns about McAlinden and children?
A. No. Look, I'd be guessing.

MR HUNT: Don't guess. That's the evidence. I'd ask the witness be excused.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt. Thank you very much, Ms Doyle, for your evidence, and you are now excused.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW.
MS LONERGAN: I call John Francis Davoren.
MR BARAN: Commissioner, I seek an order under section 23.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Baran, that is noted.
<JOHN FRANCIS DAVOREN, sworn
[2.52pm]

## <EXAMINATION BY MS LONERGAN:

MS LONERGAN: Q. Is your full name John Francis Davoren?
A. It is.
Q. I think you have some hearing difficulties?
A. I do.
Q. So do I, so we'11 try both to keep our voices up.
A. Very good.
Q. That microphone in front of you amplifies a little bit, not a lot. Mr Davoren, you were ordained as a Catholic priest in 1960?
A. I was, yes.
Q. You were ordained to the archdiocese of Sydney and incardinated to the archdiocese?
A. Yes .
Q. You practised as a priest until about 1982; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. During your time as a priest you completed a bachelor of social work; is that right?
A. A bachelor of arts, diploma of social work.
Q. Was that in about 1965 you completed that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you did a masters in Ohio, which led to the degree of masters in science and social administration?
A. At Western Reserve, Cleveland, Ohio.
Q. You were employed as director of Centacare Sydney at some point in 1971?
A. I was on the staff in Centacare from 1965, appointed director in 1971.
Q. When you were on the staff at Centacare, did you do general social-work-type duties as well as priestly duties? A. I did.
Q. As director of Centacare, can you just outline briefly what that role involved?
A. I had a staff of some 12, 15. I had to raise money to have the operation work and we were responsible for
admitting children to orphanages. I had a role in
adoption. I was advising the Bishops Conference on welfare matters. There were quite a lot of implications in the job.
Q. You're aware that this Special Commission of Inquiry is very particularly focused on allegations of sexual abuse on the part of two particular priests?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm going to confine the questions that I ask you about your later role to your involvement in relation to those two priests, but before I do I have some preliminary matters to ask about. While you were director of Centacare, or an employee of Centacare, did you come to learn of any sexual abuse allegations regarding priests and children?
A. No.
Q. Are you able to identify at what point you first became aware of allegations of sexual abuse on the part of priests against children?
A. I would think probably only when I took on the job of director of Professional Standards.
Q. You left the priesthood in about 1982; is that right? A. I stepped down in 1982. I didn't get released until 1987.
Q. In between your time stepping down from the priest hood and the time you commenced your role in the Professional Standards Office, which was 1997, did you carry out any social work employment?
A. I was the chairman of the Alternate Care Committee for two years, adviser to the minister for children's services.
I then went and worked for a large welfare agency, The Benevolent Society. I was briefly - yes, I was welfare director there for five years. My final year there I was the CEO of the Royal Hospital for Women, and then I moved on to be a member of the Veterans Review Board for six years.
Q. In those roles, was there any aspect where you had
involvement in allegations of sexual abuse on the part of priests?
A. Yes.
Q. There was? Within those --
A. No, no, only at that particular office, yes.
Q. I'm sorry, I probably confused you by the way I've gone about the process. In 1997 you commenced your role as the director at the Professional Standards Office?
A. For New South Wales and the ACT.
Q. Prior to that role commencing, and in those jobs that you've just outlined in your previous answers, did you have any aspect that involved you looking at sexual abuse allegations against priests?
A. No.
Q. How did your job at the Professional Standards Office come up? Was it a new role, or did you take over from somebody else? If you can outline the circumstances.
A. It was a new role and I was approached - asked if I was interested in the job and I actually said no, but they gave me an interview anyway and I got the job.
Q. In terms of how the role was described for you, was it a role that was already established, or did you have to make it up as you went along to an extent?
A. It was established in the Towards Healing document, but I had to set up the office and the procedures and protocol in accordance with those stipulations.
Q. I understand you're not able to identify exactly what month you commenced your work with the Professional Standards Office; is that right?
A. Yes, I'm not sure precisely.
Q. Is it fair to say that in the initial phases the way in which certain activities were carried out by the Professional Standards Office were not perfectly documented? Is that a fair statement? .

MR BARAN: I object to the question. It's a bit too wide. What procedures are involved?

MS LONERGAN: I'11 withdraw it. I will try to frame it in another way.
Q. Given that your evidence is to the effect that part of your role was setting up systems of managing the role that you had, was that a bit of a trial and error process initially?
A. No, I don't think so. That's not my memory of it. Things could be improved, but it was workable.
Q. Was part of your role at the Professional Standards Office to set up a system by which certain allegations about certain priests could be reported to the police? A. Yes .
Q. Was that something that came into play very early on in your period as the director, or was it something that evolved?
A. It started pretty early.
Q. Was there part of the Towards Healing processes that gave you any particular guidelines as to how things should be done in terms of reporting to police and when things should be done?
A. We had a statement of complaint in which everyone who made a complaint was advised of the possibility of going to the police and, in many cases, we encouraged them to, and we also offered to assist them to do so if they wanted to. We also had others who said they did not wish to report to the police. We had it carefully phrased that they signed off to that, but they were saying, in effect, "At this moment I do not intend." There was no possibility of it being seen later as a commitment not to report to the police.
Q. Mr Davoren, I'm going to take you to some examples of those Towards Healing complaint forms and that type of documentation in a minute. I just want to examine a little further one of your answers. You stated that "we encouraged persons who came forward to go to the police". By "we", who do you mean?
A. The people who were taking the complaint were all advised that that was the procedure they were to use and it was actually stated in the statement of complaint.
Q. Those people who were enlisted to assist with taking complaints, how were those people chosen?
A. They were chosen by the Wollongong office of Centacare.
Q. So they would be people with a background in child protection or social work background, things of that nature?
A. Largely so, yes.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Yes.
Q. So the procedure was that these statements of complaint would be taken by these individuals?
A. Yes.
Q. And provided to a central location, that is, the Professional Standards Office?
A. They were sent to me, yes.
Q. And then you personally would ensure, would you, that they were provided to the relevant bishop, just focusing only on priests at this stage?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you would expect a certain interchange between the bishop and you as to how these complaints would be dealt with?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was all under the Towards Healing process?
A. Yes.
Q. Can we take it from your evidence, and the timing of your commencement in your role, that you're unable to assist with what happened with complaints made before 1997 and how they were managed under any previous regime?
A. Yes, that was not seen as being my role. I became involved only if there were complaints later about some of those subjects that were prior to my appointment.
Q. So you would be unable to assist with matters such as Father Brian Lucas's involvement in the Special Issues Resource Group or any matters of that nature if they were before your time in your role?
A. No, I would not.
Q. You would not be able to assist.
A. No.
Q. Thank you. Mr Davoren, I'm going to take you to some specific documents dealing with the two priests with whom we are dealing. To your right is a series of intimidating looking bundles. I'm going to ask you to reach for volume 4 and take you through some of the documents in there that were related to your activity. If you can turn to tab 304, which for those at the bar table is exhibit 93. You see behind tab 304, Mr Davoren, is a letter dated 10 August 1999 directed to you?
A. Yes.
Q. From a Reverend Burston?
A. Yes.
Q. At the time, working in your role as director of the Professional Standards Office, did you on occasion receive letters like this?
A. I did, yes.
Q. And in terms of the information in the letter, what did you then do with it as general practice to communicate it to the police? Did you convert it into some other form, or did you have a standard practice as to how you would deal with this type of information as at August 1999?
A. That was advising me that they had made a complaint.
Q. Yes.
A. That's how it would be treated as intelligence. We did not get the complaint, so I would have assumed that the diocese had spoken of that.
Q. Does it appear from this particular letter that there was no formal Towards Healing complaint made, but the information was coming in a different form?
A. Yes .
Q. But you could still deal with it in an appropriate fashion in terms of passing the information to the police? A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to say now what sort of education was provided by the Professional Standards Office to bishops and their staff so that they knew what information to give to you?
A. A response to the complaint, you mean?
Q. Yes, just any information that's provided by the

Professional Standards Office to assist people in the diocese, and bishops in particular, to know what work you did and how you could assist in terms of passing matters on to the police.
A. Yes.
Q. Were there education programs or how did that information get conveyed to those different dioceses?
A. When I received the complaint, I studied it and then I came to conclusions about the next step. I put this in a letter form to the bishop with a statement of complaint.
Q. I'm just asking for a step back from that. How did the bishops know about you and the work that you did and the procedures they needed to follow? Was that purely by virtue of the Towards Healing document being circulated?
A. No, I --
Q. If you are not able to say?
A. I understand that the development of Towards Healing was something that was approved by both the council of bishops and the council of religious superiors, so there was discussion at that level about it and there were teaching procedures, I understand, at bishop conference level.
Q. Did you on occasion attend meetings of the bishops to give any further information, or was that not part of your role?
A. I did appear before the national conference of bishops, but I don't think in reference to anything about the particular role.
Q. So your understanding is that the Towards Healing process was communicated to the different bishops and dioceses?
A. Yes.
Q. And then they would know from that what to provide to you, at least in general terms?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr Davoren, I'11 show you another document which will stop me having to ask many other questions, and it is behind tab 309. You see that's a child sexual abuse information dissemination form?
A. Yes.
Q. It appears to be directed to NSW Police Service Child Protection Enforcement Agency, so CPEA?
A. Yes .
Q. Can you just outline in broad terms the role of the CPEA as you understood it in August 1999?
A. That was the police body that I was to speak to, and I had a series of communications with them, written ones. I visited them in their Redfern office on occasions and discussed specific cases with them.
Q. This particular form - I want you to take a moment to have a look at the information that is annotated on it this particular format, was that a type of form that you would use to communicate information to that agency?
A. That's my memory of it, yes.
Q. You see down the bottom where it says "Notifying person", your name is there as acting on behalf of Bishop Malone. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And there's a date 24 August 1999. So that's something like two weeks or a little less than two weeks 12 days - since the letter was received in your office. Is that the general sort of turnaround time as at 1999 in terms of you receiving information and then passing it on to the police, or did it vary?
A. It varied.
Q. Was it your usual practice to try and pass the information on to the police within as reasonable a time frame or as quickly as you could do so?
A. I guess it depended on the nature of the complaint, but generally, yes.
Q. In relation to complaints of a possible paedophile or paedophile activity, would you attempt to try and pass that information on as soon as you could?
A. In this particular case, since it refers to McAlinden, I already knew that the police were well aware of the situation.
Q. Why do you say that you already knew the police were well aware of the situation as at August 1999?
A. I was advised by the diocese that he had a number of
complaints against him.
Q. Yes.
A. And that he had been - he had his faculties removed in 1939 so he was not functioning as a priest in the diocese.
Q. You get that from the letter of 10 August 1999 behind tab 304 that we've just been looking at.
A. Yes.
Q. Why did that make you form the view that the police were already engaged?
A. There was a reference to the fact that there was a warrant out for his arrest by then.
Q. I'm going to show you some other documents that are dated October 1999, which do bear the information that you're now talking about. I don't want to split hairs about August and October 1999, but would you agree with me that it may be that you're thinking about information that became clear to you in October 1999, or are you confident on some basis that you knew things in August 1999, that the police were involved?
A. I could not make any definite statement about the months. I don't have a clear picture on that.
Q. We'11 go through and be assisted by the documents unless you have a strong recollection that you were actually told by a specific person information about police involvement in August 1999. Do you have any such recollection, or are you reliant on a memory that may be a month or two out?
A. Yes, I - I can't make a definitive statement on that issue.
Q. So, with the child protection dissemination of information form that we've just been looking at behind tab 309, you see under the heading "Suspect details" there is the name of the priest, Denis McAlinden, and then in the last question in that part of the form there is:

Does this person currently have access to children?

These words appear:
Not as far as is known.

Do you see that?
A. I see that, yes.
Q. Do you know where that information came from?
A. My understanding is that once the priest has his
faculties removed he may not function as a priest.
Q. Is that your information there on that form? Can we assume that it is?
A. Well, I was advised - again, I'm not sure of the dates - that his faculties were removed in 1993, which means that he should not have been able to function as a priest anywhere in the world thereafter.
Q. Did you put that information on the form "not as far as is known" based on your perception that as the man, McAlinden, wasn't functioning as a priest, that that meant that he wouldn't have access to children? Is that the way you read that part of the form?
A. No, no, I'm only talking of it as a priest.
Q. I understand. You see under the heading "Offence details" there is "Date/Year Range" and you've got after that or it's noted after that "Not provided"; do you see that?
A. Sorry?
Q. There is a heading about two-thirds of the way down the page headed "Offence details".
A. Yes, right.
Q. And the first item is "Date/Year Range" and then there are the words that appear "Not provided"; do you see that?
A. Right.
Q. Did you have a usual practice as at August 1999 to get the dates that the offences occurred?
A. The offences that I was dealing with, yes; history, no.
Q. Is that because this information that came through was treated on a different basis to the usual Towards Healing complaints that you managed?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it the position that you would use this material
as intelligence to convey to the police, to the extent that you had it and could use it?
A. And I was already advised that the police had put out a warrant for his arrest quite some time before.
Q. We'11 come to that and check the dates on that shortly.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I tender that form.
THE COMMISSIONER: The child sexual abuse information, dissemination to the police form behind tab 309 will be admitted and marked exhibit 171.

EXHIBIT \#171 CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE INFORMATION, DISSEMINATION TO THE POLICE FORM (TAB 309).

MS LONERGAN: Q. I'm just going to take you through the other correspondence that occurred around about that time before we go forward to some things that happened in October 1999. Mr Davoren, if you would not mind looking at the document that appears behind tab 308, and you see that is a short letter dated 24 August 1999 to Father Burston by you, the document behind tab 308.
A. Oh, I've got 307. Right.
Q. You see that letter?
A. Yes.
Q. You say in that letter:

We seem to have missed each other by a day or so.

Was it your usual practice then to make a phone call to the person who sent you the information at the diocese?
A. Yes, frequently I would. I wouldn't say I always did it, but yes.
Q. Would you agree that appears to be what you're referring to there, that you had made an attempt at contact at least with Mr Burston?
A. Yes.
Q. Sorry, Father Burston?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you go on to say:

> I will pass the matter on to the police and send you a copy of the formal
> communication.
A. Yes.
Q. What was your practice then in terms of what the formal communication was that you would send back to the diocese?
A. I would resend a copy of what I had sent to the police.
Q. The usual practice that you followed then would have been to send a copy of the form that appears behind tab 309?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recollect whether you had any discussions with Father Burston about this particular information that you conveyed to the police, and if you don't have any recollection, please say so.
A. I don't have any recollection.

MS LONERGAN: I tender that letter.
THE COMMISSIONER: It's already tendered, 164.
MS LONERGAN: I'm indebted to you, Commissioner.
Q. Mr Davoren, you've given some evidence to the effect that under Towards Healing these documents received by you as director of the Professional Standards Office were called complaints - statement of complaint?
A. Yes.
Q. Behind tab 310 is a statement of complaint dated 5 October 1999 regarding McAlinden. I ask you to just have a look at that and as well, to assist you, and I'll give you a moment to have a look at this document as well, behind tab 316 is a letter from you to [AE], which is the pseudonym of the lady who made this complaint, indicating that you received the complaint. .

MR BARAN: Can I intervene at this point? Does the witness have the pseudonym list in the witness box?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Mr Davoren, there used to be in the witness box a list of pseudonyms on a loose piece of paper.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS LONERGAN: Can I suggest a five-minute break to allow the witness to have a look at the statement of complaint and to familiarise himself with the pseudonym list?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
SHORT ADJOURNMENT
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, thank you for that time. That enabled Mr Davoren to have a moment to read that quite long complaint document which is handwritten.

Commissioner, before I proceed with the further questions, there has been a request from the media for access to exhibits 162 to 171 inclusive. If anyone at the bar table has an objection, if they could let me know or those who assist you know by 4.15 .
Q. Mr Davoren, you've had an opportunity to read the statement of complaint behind tab 310. Mr Davoren?
A. Yes .
Q. Did you also take the opportunity to have a look at the letter of yours behind tab 316 to Ms [AE]?
A. Right. Yes, yes.
Q. Just leaving the pages open at the letter behind tab 316, was that your usual procedure, that you would send a letter to the person who had been involved in a statement of complaint advising them of what your plans were in terms of managing it?
A. Yes .
Q. And, in this particular case, you mentioned that there is a police investigation on foot. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it your usual practice to comment to that effect, that the next step will be the police investigation in circumstances where the complainant had reported the matter
to the police?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there a reason for that in terms of the general conduct of the Professional Standards Office, why the complainants were told that the police investigation will happen first?
A. I don't understand the question.
Q. Was there a policy or procedure reason why complainants were advised that the police investigation would happen first before any activity by the Professional Standards Office?
A. That was the standard procedure, yes. We certainly didn't carry out any investigation if the police was investigating.
Q. Would the usual practice be to discuss with the bishop any contents of a statement of complaint where it involved a priest who had engaged in sexually abusive conduct with a child, that is, any actions on your part? Would you ring the bishop or write to the bishop to talk about the level of conduct that had been complained about?
A. I would send the statement of complaint to the bishop, so he has all of this.
Q. And that was your usual practice?
A. Yes.
Q. And, in this case, just look behind tab 317, there is a letter dated 8 October 1999 by you to Bishop Malone. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you see in the last paragraph, as well as enclosing the particular statement of complaint, you say that you would "be happy to talk to you about any or all of this as you wish"?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that something you usually wrote to the bishops, once you sent a complaint like this?
A. Yes.
Q. Having had an opportunity to read the content of the complaint by [AE], would you agree with me that it is a high level sexual offence?
A. Yes.
Q. In terms of sexual offences of a high level, did you change your practice at all in the way that you would deal with the bishops or deal with the complaint?
A. Well, in this case, he was no longer in the diocese, so that makes it somewhat different, but the procedure would be the same.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I tender the statement of complaint of [AE].

THE COMMISSIONER: That is behind tab 310. The statement of complaint of [AE] will be exhibit 172.

EXHIBIT \#172 STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT OF [AE] (TAB 310).
MS LONERGAN: I'11 just ask one more question about that before we turn to another document.
Q. On the second page of that statement of complaint in a box about a quarter of the way down the page there is a particular part that deals with notification to the police. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. You gave evidence earlier to the effect that complainants are asked to make it clear in their complaint what they want to do regarding the police? You gave evidence today to that effect.
A. Yes.
Q. So this box is where the complainant can notify their intentions?
A. That's right.
Q. That's what she has done here, that she intends to notify the police?
A. Yes.

MS LONERGAN: I also tender the document behind tab 316, a letter to [AE].

THE COMMISSIONER: The letter to [AE] from Mr Davoren of 8 October 1999 will be exhibit 173.

EXHIBIT \#173 LETTER TO [AE] FROM MR DAVOREN OF 8/10/1999 (TAB 316).

MS LONERGAN: A1so the document behind tab 317, the letter from Mr Davoren to Bishop Malone.

THE COMMISSIONER: The letter of the same date, 8 October 1999, will be exhibit 174.

## EXHIBIT \#174 LETTER DATED 8/10/1999 FROM MR DAVOREN TO REVEREND MALONE (TAB 317).

MS LONERGAN: Q. I'm going to ask you a question, and there's no problem at all if you don't recollect, but in your letter of 8 October 1999 to Bishop Malone where you suggest that you would be happy to talk to Bishop Malone about this particular complaint, are you able to recollect whether you did so or not?
A. Sorry, I didn't hear that.
Q. Are you able to recollect whether you actually spoke to Bishop Malone about this particular complaint at or around about this time?
A. No, I can't recall whether I did or not.
Q. Behind tab 318 is a report on counselling provided to
[AE] by Evelyn Woodward. Do you see that, pages 786 and 787?
A. I do.
Q. Can you outline who Evelyn Woodward was - or is?
A. The name rings a bell, but $I$ can't remember in detail.

She was a qualified counsellor, and counselling was offered.
Q. Was she a religious sister?
A. No.
Q. No?
A. No.
Q. Not a religious sister?
A. No.
Q. Are you confident that Evelyn Woodward was not a religious sister?
A. No, I can't be that confident, but I'd be surprised if
she was. We normally didn't refer people to religious sisters for counselling.
Q. But if the religious sister was a qualified counsellor, there may have been an exception, would you agree?
A. No, I think we would have avoided that.
Q. You say you "think we would have avoided that". You have a personal view, do you, that that would not be an appropriate thing to do, to refer someone to a religious sister, or do you have a reason for offering that view? A. Yes, I would think there's a possibility that girls who grew up in convents, went to convent schools, would have a rather unsettling reaction to nuns.
Q. So it's the nuns' sensibilities that you're worried about as opposed to the other way around, or is it something more subtle?
A. No, it's the victim, that we would not wish to burden her with something unnecessary. It would be better to have a non religious as the counsellor.
Q. A lay person as the counsellor?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr Davoren, if you would not mind looking behind tab 324, there's a letter from you dated 7 February 2000 to Bishop Malone. I'11 just give you a moment to read that. A. Right, I've read it.
Q. Was it your usual practice to take calls from complainants on occasions as director at Professional Standards Office?
A. Yes .
Q. Do you remember this particular lady, talking to this particular lady, or not?
A. I don't have a particular memory of it, no.
Q. In the third-last paragraph you suggest that "some direct action by the church" in her regard would be of assistance. Do you see that?
A. Yes .
Q. And was that usual for you to write to bishops in that way where you suggest some direct action?
A. Yes.
Q. And the reason behind that, was it to comply with the Towards Healing type of interface between victim and diocese? Is that why, or --
A. It was a facilitated meeting usually, so that the person met the bishop and the bishop could respond, and it was in many cases very helpful.
Q. Did you have more than one occasion to deal with Bishop Malone in relation to these Towards Healing-type complaints, and if you're unable to remember, please just say so.
A. Well, there was the McAlinden case and the Fletcher case. I don't know of any other.
Q. By my question, which was badly worded, what I meant was did you on more than one occasion deal with Bishop Malone in relation to victims of McAlinden's?
A. No, I don't have a specific memory about that. There was a second complaint in 2001 or so.
Q. Which we'll come to, yes.
A. So I was dealing with that, too, yes.

MS LONERGAN: I tender the letter of 7 February 2000 to Bishop Malone.

THE COMMISSIONER: The letter of 7 February 2000 from Mr Davoren to Bishop Malone will be admitted and marked exhibit 175.

EXHIBIT \#175 LETTER DATED 7/2/2000 FROM MR DAVOREN TO BISHOP MALONE (TAB 324).

MS LONERGAN: Q. Just before we turn away from that particular letter, Mr Davoren, in paragraph 2 you talk about having received a phone call from [AE] and that she'd just been to the Maitland police, spoken to an officer and withdrawn her police complaint. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to recollect whether you had any role in encouraging or discouraging her from reactivating her complaint at all? If you don't recall, please say so. A. I don't recall, no.
Q. Behind tab 325 is a letter from Bishop Malone to you. A. 325 , is it?
Q. Yes, 325. You see it's a letter dated 28 February 2000 and you see - I certainly don't mean to trick you and I appreciate it's some time ago - in the second paragraph there is a mention of Sister Evelyn Woodward having provided counselling.
A. That rather disproves that she wasn't a religious. Yes, okay.
Q. Do you have a view as to the appropriateness or otherwise of a religious sister providing counselling in relation to this particular complaint?
A. In hindsight, I would have thought that it would be a mistake, but perhaps at the time I wasn't thinking as clearly as that.
Q. Is it fair to say this was in the first few years of the Professional Standards Office --
A. Yes.
Q. -- doing its role?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: It must be said, Mr Davoren, that Sister Woodward gives no indication in the way she signs the letter that you looked at earlier that she has any status as a religious nun.

THE WITNESS: Obviously I was wrong, yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: But perhaps understandably so as she didn't sign herself "sister".

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS LONERGAN: Q. You see that in the second-last paragraph Bishop Malone states that he's happy to take cognisance of your suggestion about a facilitated meeting. A. Yes.
Q. And that's a positive sign from Bishop Malone, is it not?
A. Yes.

MS LONERGAN: I tender that letter, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: The letter to Mr Davoren from Bishop Malone of 28 February 2000 will be admitted and marked exhibit 176.

## EXHIBIT \#176 LETTER TO MR DAVOREN FROM BISHOP MALONE OF 28/2/2000 (TAB 325).

MS LONERGAN: Q. Mr Davoren, if you would not mind looking behind tab 326, it's a letter dated 31 March 2000 from you to Bishop Malone. Just read that to yourself. A. Yes .
Q. You see there's mention that Bishop Malone intended to discuss some aspects of the matter with [AE]'s therapist Sister Evelyn Woodward. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. I appreciate everybody is wise after the event, but given what you know now in broad terms as to the way in which these things perhaps could best be managed, what's your opinion about that particular proposed discussion, that is, a discussion between Bishop Malone and [AE]'s therapist?
A. It would be a way of identifying the degree of damage that had been done. There's the question of
confidentiality and [AE] would have had to agree to that discussion before a discussion took place between the therapist and the bishop.
Q. Was it your usual practice in 2000, Mr Davoren, to encourage further contact by the bishop with the particular victim, if you thought that would be a helpful thing?
A. Yes .
Q. And, on occasion, you received calls from complainants and you could help facilitate the best process for the victims.
A. Yes.
Q. Was that part of the way you tried to complete your role?
A. It was.

MS LONERGAN: I tender that letter of 31 March, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: The letter from Mr Davoren to Bishop Malone of 31 March 2000 will be admitted and marked exhibit 177.

## EXHIBIT \#177 LETTER FROM MR DAVOREN TO BISHOP MALONE DATED 31/3/2000 (TAB 326).

MS LONERGAN: Q. In the following tab, 327, Mr Davoren, there is a letter from Bishop Malone to you acknowledging your letter and discussing the proposal to meet with [AE] and reassure her that she's not being rejected by the church. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And that would have assisted in your processes and confirmed that Bishop Malone understood the importance of what you had asked him to do?
A. Very much so.

MS LONERGAN: I tender that letter, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: The letter to Mr Davoren from Bishop Malone of 10 May 2000 will be admitted and marked exhibit 178.

## EXHIBIT \#178 LETTER TO MR DAVOREN FROM BISHOP MALONE DATED 10/5/2000 (TAB 327).

MS LONERGAN: Q. Mr Davoren, we'11 have a break from the documents for the moment. Were there procedures at the Professional Standards Office whereby you were asked on occasion to assist with the location of any missing priests, or priests who weren't still working within their diocese?
A. No.
Q. Do you recollect now any discussions with Bishop Malone regarding the police looking for McAlinden?
A. No, I have no memory of any discussion of that kind.
Q. I'm going to ask you to close that volume and reach for volume 5. Look at the document behind tab 332. This is a document addressed to the National Committee for Professional Standards. I'm going to ask you to look at it overnight, but my question is a general one. Were you on the National Committee for Professional Standards, or not? A. No.
Q. So that committee was comprised of persons other than directors of various state professional standards offices, was that the position? It doesn't give you much help in the document itself as to whom it's directed, but my question is a more general one, Mr Davoren, whether you, by virtue of being the director of the Professional Standards Office in New South Wales, would be part of the National Committee for Professional Standards?
A. No.
Q. You've just had a quick look at that document I notice. Is this a document you've seen before or not? A. No, I have not seen that before. That's from the Congregation for the Defence [sic] of Faith. It sounds as if it's come from the Vatican.
Q. Can we take it that, other than being asked to do a special guest appearance, you would not normally be present at any bishops' committee for professional standards?
A. No. I was answerable to a committee made up of five two bishops and three heads of religious orders and they were answerable to the two conferences at state level, New South Wales.
Q. In your role as director of the New South Wales office, did you have any role in the drafting of or review of the mandate of the National Committee for Professional Standards?
A. No.
Q. That will speed things up significantly, you'11 be pleased to know. If you look at the documents behind tabs 344 and 345 , it's another complaint about McAlinden by a lady we're referring to as [AC]. Have you had a look at that?
A. Yes.
Q. The part I'm directing your particular attention to is the second page of the statement of complaint in the part that deals with the reporting to police.
A. Yes.
Q. You see there that this particular person has put an asterisk and said "see addendum", although she's noted that she doesn't intend to notify the police and she hasn't notified the police. Then if I can direct your attention
to the addendum which appears on page 912 , and you see that this particular person said:

If other serious complaints are made about
Father McAlinden, if the Professional
Standards Office is made aware through other complaints of other (criminal)
behaviour by him, then I would like my
experience to be used in corroboration.
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. It's headed "Addendum re criminal behaviour". You see that at the top there.
A. Yes.
Q. Having read [AE]'s complaint, which is the one you read over the short break that we had, that was setting out criminal behaviour, wasn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And this complaint sets out criminal behaviour as well, doesn't it?
A. It does.
Q. Are you able to say now whether you let the police know about this particular wish of [AC]?
A. My recollection is that I notified the police that we had received this complaint, but I did not identify the complainant, and I presume - and this is just a presumption - that, had they indicated they wanted to follow that up directly, that I would approach the complainant and see if I could talk her into us giving her name as well.
Q. So is that the way things worked with the CPEA at the time, now we're looking at mid 2002, that information would be conveyed to them, the CPEA --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and they would get in touch with you when you could then be a liaison point to see if any victims wanted to come forward with more details?
A. Yes.
Q. On occasion, did that happen, did that function
successfully, that you were contacted by the CPEA and you were able to assist facilitating matters proceeding down the course of police involvement?
A. In other cases, yes. I have no memory of these cases.
Q. That's a very proper answer, thank you. Behind tab 345 is a letter by you to [AC] acknowledging her particular complaint and confirming that you sent it to Bishop Malone?
A. Right.

MS LONERGAN: And, Commissioner, I tender the statement of complaint behind tab 344 and the letter from Mr Davoren to [AC] behind tab 345.

THE COMMISSIONER: The statement of complaint by [AC] behind tab 344 will be admitted and marked exhibit 179.

EXHIBIT \#179 STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT BY [AC] (TAB 344).
THE COMMISSIONER: The letter behind tab 345 from Mr Davoren to [AC] will be exhibit 180.

EXHIBIT \#180 LETTER DATED 14/6/2002 FROM MR DAVOREN (TAB 345).

MS LONERGAN: Q. I'm going to ask you if you've seen the letter that appears behind tab 346 before. I'm not suggesting that you necessarily have. It's a letter dated 20 June 2002 by Bishop Malone to [AC] and in the first paragraph there is a mention of the following, that McAlinden is still alive and living in Western Australia.
A. Right.
Q. First of all, have you seen this letter before?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Did you see it in preparation for giving evidence, or on some other occasion?
A. In preparation to giving evidence, yes.
Q. Prior to that, had you seen this particular letter before?
A. I was aware that the bishop had contacted [AC] and I think he had a meeting with her, but I wouldn't swear to that.
Q. In terms of any basis for knowledge that McAlinden was still alive and living in Western Australia, as at 2002 was any information to that effect shared with you?
A. No, I --
Q. If you don't recollect, please say so.
A. -- can't remember.
Q. Was it your impression, based on what you knew from various sources, that nobody was sure where McAlinden was at the time you were dealing with complaints in relation to him?
A. That was, yes, the impression I got.

MS LONERGAN: Is that a convenient time, Commissioner?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.
MS LONERGAN: I understand Mr Kell has a particular administrative matter that needs to be attended to.

MR KELL: Commissioner, practitioners have previously been notified that certain statutory declarations would be tendered today at this time relating to both TOR-1 and TOR-2. There have been some communications and some redactions to some of the documents, but I will just tender them. There are ten documents to tender and I'll tender them one by one, if I can. The first --

THE COMMISSIONER: May Mr Davoren stand down?
MR KELL: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Davoren. You are excused.

THE WITNESS: Do I have to appear again?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, we are not quite finished with you yet, I am sorry to say. 10 o'clock tomorrow for Mr Davoren?

MS LONERGAN: Yes, and for Mr Davoren's benefit, I'11 be about another 15 minutes in examining him and then others at the bar table may take a little time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, sir. See you tomorrow.

MR KELL: If I deal with them in two batches, I hand up the first batch, Commissioner. I'll deal first with five statutory declarations that relate to the TOR-1 witnesses. The first is a statutory declaration of Kylie Cronin dated 2 July 2013.

THE COMMISSIONER: The statutory declaration of Kylie Marie Cronin will be admitted and marked exhibit 181.

EXHIBIT \#181 STATUTORY DECLARATION OF KYLIE MARIE CRONIN.
MR KELL: The second is a statutory declaration of Chief Superintendent Malcolm Lanyon dated 3 July 2013 and I tender that.

THE COMMISSIONER: The statutory declaration by Malcolm Arthur Lanyon will be admitted and marked exhibit 182.

## EXHIBIT \#182 STATUTORY DECLARATION BY MALCOLM ARTHUR LANYON

 DATED 3/7/2013.MR KELL: The third is a statutory declaration of Detective Inspector Ann Joy dated 4 July 2013. I tender that.

THE COMMISSIONER: The statutory declaration of Ann Louise Joy will be admitted and marked exhibit 183.

EXHIBIT \#183 STATUTORY DECLARATION OF ANN LOUISE JOY DATED 4/7/2013.

MR KELL: The fourth is a statutory declaration of Sergeant Scott Metcalfe dated 2 July 2013. I tender that.

THE COMMISSIONER: The statutory declaration of Scott Andrew Metcalfe will be admitted and marked exhibit 184.

EXHIBIT \#184 STATUTORY DECLARATION OF SCOTT ANDREW METCALFE DATED 2/7/2013

MR KELL: The fifth of that batch is a statutory declaration of Sergeant Stephen Rae dated 2 July 2013 and I tender that.

THE COMMISSIONER: The statutory declaration of Stephen David Rae will be admitted and marked exhibit 185.

## EXHIBIT \#185 STATUTORY DECLARATION OF STEPHEN DAVID RAE DATED 2/7/2013.

MR KELL: Commissioner, there are two further declarations relating to TOR-1, which I'11 just hand up two copies. There is a statutory declaration of Hamish Fitzhardinge dated 17 July 2013. I tender that.

THE COMMISSIONER: The statutory declaration of Hamish Berkeley Fitzhardinge will be admitted and marked exhibit 186.

## EXHIBIT \#186 STATUTORY DECLARATION OF HAMISH BERKELEY FITZHARDINGE DATED 17/7/2013.

MR KELL: And a statutory declaration of Jillian Kelton dated 2 July 2013. I tender that.

THE COMMISSIONER: The statutory declaration of Jillian Ann Kelton will be admitted and marked exhibit 187.

EXHIBIT \#187 STATUTORY DECLARATION OF JILLIAN ANN KELTON DATED 2/7/2013.

MR GYLES: There is an issue in relation to the annexure to that. Redactions have been made. The outstanding issue concerns the third page of the annexure and, Commissioner, you'11 see in the paragraph commencing "the OIC". I should indicate, Commissioner, that this annexure is Detective Kelton's --

THE COMMISSIONER: I think Ms Kelton is a solicitor.
MR GYLES: I'm sorry, it is Jillian Kelton's notes of a conference with then Detective Sergeant Fox, who is described in the document as the OIC, the officer in charge. On the third page there is a reference to the OIC speaking to Father Searle.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR GYLES: The words that we say should not be permitted to be tendered commence about halfway through that paragraph from the word "Early" through to the end of the following paragraph, which is the word "close". The reasons for this, Commissioner, are, first, that this is
not a document we had, for example, when we were cross-examining Detective Chief Inspector Fox. Therefore, it is of marginal utility or probative value in any event.

Secondly, this is a matter which you have received direct evidence of, and the description that we see that was given to the solicitor by Detective Sergeant Fox at the time is different, in a sense, from that, and the language is pejorative, particularly if one goes to, for example, the final sentence, and it is of no real assistance to you.

In my respectful submission, this material would not be able to be tendered in this way where you have the best evidence going to this matter and in any event it would be mischievous for it to be able to be reported in the way in which the language is used.

THE COMMISSIONER: The problem is, Mr Gyles, is it not, once again, and it has not arisen for a while, it is pertinent for me to have before me material of that kind in order to determine certain matters about the person referred to as the OIC there.

MR GYLES: I can appreciate that. If you take that position, then $I$ would restrict the application to one of non publication --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR GYLES: -- given that it does muddy the waters on an issue that has now been fully dealt with and it deals with it in an emotive way which might lead to it being unhelpful, for want of a neutral term, in terms of the reporting of, for example, what we see in the final second of the paragraphs that I'm seeking a non publication order.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. From what the person referred to as the OIC observes in relation to one person and his statement, the whole of the Catholic Church gets the blame.

MR GYLES: The use of the words "strange" and "bizarre", that's a very unusual way to look at what's happened and you've then got what is, as I say, a pejorative statement as to his views about what the consequences are. It is simply not helpful.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Frankly, I'm inclined to the view
that that section ought not be published, Mr Kell. Do you have any violent opposition to that course?

MR KELL: Not "violent" opposition, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: I make a non-publication order in relation to the words on page 3 of annexure A to Ms Kelton's statutory declaration from the words commencing "Early the following week" until "close" in the first and second paragraphs on that page.

MR KELL: Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner, there are three declarations relating to the second term of reference, and I'11 just hand them up. Commissioner, the first is a statutory declaration of Bishop Justin Joseph Bianchini dated 5 Apri1 2013.

THE COMMISSIONER: The statutory declaration of Justin Joseph Bianchini of 5 April 2013 will be admitted and marked exhibit 188.

## EXHIBIT \#188 STATUTORY DECLARATION OF JUSTIN JOSEPH BIANCHINI DATED 5/4/2013.

MR GYLES: Commissioner, can I say something about this while it's being tendered? You might appreciate, Commissioner, that the relevance of this arises from a letter of 9 June 1994, tab 236, which I don't think has been tendered yet. Commissioner, if you go to that, you'11 see that it contains some information and what Bishop Bianchini tells us is, in effect, what is the source of the information. Commissioner, you'11 see that in 2(c) that there is --

MR KELL: Commissioner, I'm tendering documents at the moment. It's not a time for making submissions about those documents, in my submission, unless there is an objection being taken.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is this an objection to the tender?
MR GYLES: I apologise to my learned friend for not giving notification of this objection, but I'll object to the second sentence of subparagraph 2(c). It indicates a possible source of information contained in the letter of 9 June 1994, and the appropriate way for that to be proved, if that information does come from Archbishop Hickey, is
for that information to come directly.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Am I to understand --
MR GYLES: That is my point.
THE COMMISSIONER: -- that what Bishop Bianchini says is that he got his information from Archbishop Hickey?

MR GYLES: That's right. That's all I'm attempting to note on the tender of this document, that it doesn't deal with direct evidence going to the source of that information.

THE COMMISSIONER: There is a gap.
MR GYLES: That's the point that $I$ was seeking to make.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Kel1, is there anything to supply that gap? Do we have anything from Archbishop Hickey?

MR KELL: Commissioner, what Bishop Bianchini indicates is his recollection as to where he obtained that information from. He's able to give that evidence, and he does so. I should also indicate that we had asked for objections to be provided at a previous time, and this has not been notified before. These are declarations that go to matters of some importance, but matters that it is not anticipated that there would be a requirement to call witnesses, but if the diocese wants the bishop to be brought over to give evidence about these matters, then steps will need to be taken.

I anticipate for the matter that is referred to in paragraph 2(c), it's a nit-picking sort of point and he's able to give the evidence he gives there as to where he got information.

MR GYLES: We're a long way from the diocese requiring the archbishop to come over here to give evidence at this point.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is he still living?
MR GYLES: I'm not sure.
MR KELL: As at 5 April, he was. I've got no information
to the contrary.
MR GYLES: I should say that I had not raised this with my learned friend, so I'm not being critical at all, but perhaps if we could deal with this --

THE COMMISSIONER: Can we tender it on the basis that it's simply what it says, that's his recollection, that's where he got the information.

MR GYLES: I'm content with that.
MR KELL: Then there is a statutory declaration of Julie Craig dated 27 June 2013. I tender that.

THE COMMISSIONER: The statutory declaration of Julie Craig will be admitted and marked exhibit 189.

EXHIBIT \#189 STATUTORY DECLARATION OF JULIE CRAIG DATED 27/6/2013.

MR KELL: Finally, there is a statutory declaration of Michae1 John Salmon dated 26 June 2013 and I tender that.

MS GERACE: Commissioner, I apologise. Could I raise an objection, and I must say I have not done this beforehand and I'm sorry that I have not. I don't know if this has been dealt with by anyone else, but in relation to paragraph 7 of Mr Salmon's statutory declaration, has that been redacted?

THE COMMISSIONER: Paragraph 7 is still there.
MS GERACE: The objection is on the basis that the information is of a very general nature and is hearsay, dealing with apparently the level of confusion within the office that he believes existed at some time about reporting requirements or otherwise. The statements are made:

> I am aware that particularly in the earlier years following the establishment of the ... Standards Office and for a period of time following my appointment in 2003 there existed an apparent level of confusion and ambiguity about certain reporting requirements concerning child sexual

And it specifically goes on to what he believes that level of confusion was. First, he speaks of a period of time prior to his appointment to the office. He then speaks about a period of time after his appointment. He does not indicate how he has obtained that information or otherwise, and its merit in those terms is very, very low, I'd submit.

THE COMMISSIONER: He speaks about the time after his appointment in 2003, and he does get more specific about where the confusion is, that is, the reporting of general intelligence information as distinct from the specific complaints.

MS GERACE: He does, but the source of that information, he doesn't say if it's something he has observed or been told. How frequent or how common that confusion was isn't apparent from the material. Its significance or otherwise, to the extent the material could be relied upon to establish a confusion to the matters before this Commission, is not really established by that material. In those circumstances, the information is of very little merit and, because it's of a hearsay nature --

THE COMMISSIONER: Is it necessarily hearsay nature if he was working there at the time?

MR GERACE: Unless it's a matter that he has observed from his own interactions, yes, it is.

THE COMMISSIONER: But he doesn't say that anyone told him that. He's talking only, isn't he, of the period after his appointment in 2003?

MR GERACE: No. Well, that's not how I read that paragraph. "I am aware ... that in the earlier years" he's talking about a time before he's come on - and for a period of time following his appointment in 2003. If he was talking about --

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you be happy if we took out "particularly in the earlier years following the estab1ishment"?

MR BARAN: This actually affects me and my client. I've been conducting the inquiry to the extent that I am
involved on the basis that this witness has not been required for cross-examination and the statutory declaration was going to be tendered without objection. There has been no notification to us in terms of there being any issue regarding Mr Salmon. If that's now going to change, we're caught by surprise.

THE COMMISSIONER: It may not change. We may be able to achieve some accommodation in the way we express things. What do you say, Mr Kell?

MR KELL: I'm content to postpone finalising the tender until the morning. If he's required for cross-examination, that can be attended to. He can certainly give the evidence which is in paragraph 7 based on his --

THE COMMISSIONER: Observations.
MR KELL: -- personal observations, which is how that paragraph could be read.

THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly for the period after he arrived there in 2003.

MR KELL: He can certainly give that evidence. I'm content to finalise the tender first thing tomorrow morning.

MS GERACE: I've indicated I'11 consider my position and speak to your counsel assisting.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Barren, you can remain in the loop.
MR BARAN: I can remain in the ether.
THE COMMISSIONER: Well, involved in productive discussions - doubtless.

MR KELL: There is a requirement for a 10.30 start tomorrow because of other matters arising.

THE COMMISSIONER: Has someone told Mr Davoren?
MR BARAN: I'11 do that.

## AT 4.16PM THE COMMISSION ADJOURNED UNTIL
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